LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 30 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 5145 .V7 1930
Vroom, Fenwick Williams,
1856-
An introduction to the
Prayer-book

AN INTRODUCTION
TO
THE PRAYER BOOK

AN INTRODUCTION
TO
THE PRAYER BOOK

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
SEP 30 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY

F. W. VROOM, D.D., D.C.L.

DEAN OF DIVINITY AT KING'S COLLEGE, HALIFAX
SENIOR CANON OF ALL SAINTS' CATHEDRAL
ARCHDEACON OF NOVA SCOTIA

"*I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also.*"—1 Cor. xiv. 15.

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

First published in 1930

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

"The Book of Common Prayer: a book so scriptural that it is full of scripture from one end to the other, and built altogether upon it; so catholic that nothing therein is found contrary to the decrees and practice of the apostolic, nay the universal Church, men's private fancies only being excluded; so comprehensive that every man finds his wants represented and his petitions anticipated; so varied that we may reap fresh pleasure from it every time we use it; so full and frequent in its offices of prayer that, let a man be as devout as he will, he will find his devotion cannot soar to a higher pitch, if it be sober, rational and Christian; and withal so elevated that it leads us above the narrow views and petty prejudices of party into the calm and holy atmosphere of heaven."

BISHOP MEDLEY.

PREFACE

In view of the many treatises, historical and explanatory, which have appeared from time to time on the subject of the Prayer Book, it may perhaps seem superfluous to add to their number; but the lack of knowledge displayed by newspaper writers and others, and the perplexity in the minds of many of our own people during the unhappy controversy over Prayer Book revision, afford, I venture to think, sufficient justification for the attempt to do something to dispel that ignorance. Excellent and reliable books on the subject are not wanting for those who will take the pains to study them. Few of the larger ones, however, are in the hands of the laity, and of the smaller ones, some are inadequate, and others are not written in a popular style, and are not adapted to consecutive reading.

What are the things which a well-instructed Churchman ought to know concerning his Prayer Book? On what points do those who are interested in the worship and discipline of the Church desire information? These are questions which we need to ask ourselves. Some opportunity of answering them, and of finding solutions for the difficulties presented, has been afforded the writer by an experience of many years as a teacher, and it is with the hope that the fruits of this experience may be of help to others that the present volume is committed to the press.

F. W. V.

King's College,
Halifax, N.S.

CONTENTS

CHAP. PAGE

I. OF LITURGICAL WORSHIP IN EARLY DAYS . 1

II. OF THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 15

III. OF THE PRELIMINARY MATTER . . . 31

IV. OF MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER (i) . . 62

V. OF MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER (ii) AND LITANY 83

VI. OF THE HOLY COMMUNION (i) . . . 108

VII. " " " (ii) . . . 134

VIII. " " " (iii) . . . 150

IX. OF THE OCCASIONAL OFFICES 170

X. OF THE ORDINAL 211

ADDITIONAL MATTER 229

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PRAYER BOOK

CHAPTER I

OF LITURGICAL WORSHIP IN EARLY DAYS

Why the Church uses a Prayer Book

THE Book of Common Prayer is the manual of public worship of the Anglican Church, and as such it possesses an authority, and has a claim upon our loyalty and esteem, second only to that of the Bible. The one supplements the other. The Bible tells us to worship God, and the Prayer Book teaches us how to worship Him. Yet the two books do not stand upon quite the same footing. The Bible has an authority peculiarly its own which has always been recognized in the Church. Its writers "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and while they wrote as men, and the personality of each is reflected in his writings, yet we must believe they were directed, illuminated and restrained by what we call Divine inspiration; and for that reason we dare not presume to alter what they have written, or either to add to or to take away from the message they have delivered. The most that we can do is to alter its outward form by new translations which endeavour from time to time to express that message more perfectly to the understanding of the people.

But with the Prayer Book it is different. It is true that it is a treasury of devotion in which there are gems inherited from the earliest ages of the Church, but the liberty has always been allowed to particular local churches of selecting, rearranging, repolishing and adding to these gems as it seemed wise to those who had the ordering of the Church's devotion. So in the long course of the Church's history many liturgies and forms of service have been drawn up, and people of different races and susceptibilities have expressed their devotions in different ways, and changing conditions and changing modes of thought have brought about alterations in forms of worship again and again, while the same faith and the same Scriptures have persisted throughout.

Then why, it may be asked, if the forms of worship are subject to change in this way, should there be any Prayer Book at all? Why should not everyone, or at least every priest in charge of a congregation, be allowed to do what is right in his own eyes in the conduct of public worship? Well, in the first place, a common worship is a bond of union, as a flag is, or a national anthem; and in the second place we can trace the use of liturgical forms to the earliest days of the Church, and feel an obligation to " hold fast the traditions which we have received." This does not mean that there is any question as to the right of the individual soul to approach God in prayer in its own way, even if it is unable to find the words in which to express its desires; for the " groanings which cannot be uttered " may by the grace of the Holy Spirit become efficacious and acceptable in God's sight. But there is a difference between public and private prayer. Each has its place, and in either case our prayer must be the prayer of faith and we must try to feel as we offer it our own unworthiness and the exceeding majesty of Almighty God,

> "Before whose throne the angels bow,
> With faces veiled in homage low."

We have each one of us our individual relationship to our heavenly Father, our individual wants and desires, for which we are taught to be "praying always, with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit." None of the things about which we are inclined to be anxious is either too great or too small to be included in our private prayer. "In everything"—how comprehensive the phrase is!—"by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." It is of these prayers that our Blessed Lord says in the Sermon on the Mount: "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret." Not your fellow-man, but God alone can know your innermost heart.

"The assembling of ourselves together," however, is different. This is for *common* worship. "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask" seems to imply a prearranged service. See how it is noted in the Acts that the disciples gathered together "with one accord," and that "they continued steadfastly," not simply, as the Authorized Version puts it, "in prayers," but, as it is more correctly rendered in the Revised Version, "in the prayers"—their customary service. And our offering of prayer and praise should be the best that we can render. If any body of men should desire to present a petition or an address of loyalty and devotion to an earthly king or ruler, they would not do it without carefully preparing it first to see that it expressed the sentiments they wished it to express in the best possible form. No less pains surely should be taken when we address the King of kings, concerning whom the Psalmist says: "Give unto the Lord the honour due unto his name; worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness."

The little band of Christ's disciples, enlightened as they were by His teaching, could no longer be satisfied with the forms of approach to God that they had learned from the Rabbis, and they said to Him, "Lord, teach us to pray," and He taught them that most simple, most beautiful and most comprehensive of all forms, which we call the "Lord's Prayer," and which the Church has used from very early times in all its offices.

"*Look unto the Rock whence ye are hewn*"

Now let us see if we can picture to ourselves what the worship of the Church in Apostolic days was like. Remember that our Blessed Lord Himself and all His immediate disciples were Jews, and from first to last gave their sanction to Jewish worship by participating in it. To "worship the Father in spirit and in truth" was in no way inconsistent with the external worship of the Synagogue or of the Temple, or we may be sure our Lord would not have gone up to Jerusalem for the great feasts, nor would He have taken part in the services of the synagogues; neither would His disciples, after His Ascension, have "continued daily in the

Temple " while they were in the Holy City, nor would St. Paul and his companions in their journeying have resorted to the synagogue every Sabbath, as long as they were allowed to do so.

Christian worship was a development of Jewish worship. The ideas of worship which the first Christians inherited from the Church of the old dispensation were —like the Law—" holy and just and good," and only needed to be adapted to the new conditions which the knowledge of Christ and the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit had brought about. The disciples learned, as quickly as their minds were able to grasp it, that they were to exchange the restricted system of Judaism for one which was broader, richer and fuller—that of the Holy Catholic Church. The old ideas were not to be set aside as mistaken; they were to be supplemented and enlarged. God, who had revealed Himself in times past through the Law and the Prophets, was now to be worshipped as revealed in His only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ. The Temple sacrifices, it is true, were fulfilled in Christ, who " by his own blood obtained eternal redemption," and the Passover found its full meaning in Him; but the feast remained for all time to signify not merely the delivery from Egyptian bondage, but the greater deliverance from the bondage of sin " by the precious blood of Christ."

Now we know definitely what the worship of the Synagogue was. It had its fixed forms of prayer; its two lessons every Sabbath, one from the Law and the other from the Prophets, arranged according to the Calendar; its singing of psalms, and its " word of exhortation " or sermon. All these elements were taken over into the Christian Church. In other words, the first public services of Christians were those of the Synagogue changed to suit altered conditions. The prayers were offered, as He Himself directed, in the name of Christ; when the Books of the New Testament were written and collected together, lessons were read from these as well as from the Jewish Scriptures, but until that time the Old Testament was the Christian Bible; Christian hymns, or Canticles, supplemented but did not displace the Psalms, and the Lord's Day, the "first day of the week," was the special day of Christian worship instead of the Sabbath, though among Jewish Christians for some time the Sabbath was honoured as well.

The Lord's Supper

Before the Apostles dispersed they were "day by day with one accord in the Temple"—that is, for general worship—"and breaking bread at home," which implied that more intimate association which no outsider might share. The distinction between the two services—the one open to the general public and the other restricted to "the faithful"—was kept up for ages even when the two were joined together in one liturgy; but this is a subject which will be considered more fully later on.

"The Breaking of Bread" refers undoubtedly to the Holy Eucharist, the highest act of Christian worship, and the customs of the Jews throw considerable light upon the institution of this service. When our Blessed Lord observed the Paschal Supper [1] with the disciples, it must be supposed that He followed the Jewish custom in its main features at least, and it is reasonable to suppose that His disciples afterwards would do as He had done, "in remembrance" of Him. The *Mishna*, or book of Jewish traditions, gives the form of thanksgiving before the breaking of bread at the Passover, which we may perhaps believe to be the same as that used by our Lord Himself. The form resembles that which is subsequently in the canon of the Eucharist.

---

[1] It is not quite certain that the Last Supper was the actual Passover meal; but if it was only a preparatory meal it would none the less be coloured with thoughts and associations of the Passover.

The term *eucharist* means *thanksgiving*, and every Christian liturgy has a form of thanksgiving similar in construction to this Jewish form, sometimes, as in Eastern liturgies, much fuller, but in our own Prayer Book, briefer. In the *Kiddush*, or weekly preparation for the Sabbath, said on Friday afternoon, also before great festivals, all present joined in saying: "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of His glory," words found in all Christian liturgies. "The Christian priest," as a modern writer puts it, "who at the eucharistic supper has taken the place of the head of the family, after seeing the glories of the Old Covenant, remembers that he is celebrating the true Passover, and has before his eyes, not the lamb of the Jewish Passover, but the true Lamb slain for the sins of the world."

Worship in the Early Church

The description of Christian worship given by Justin Martyr, who wrote about A.D. 150, speaks of those who were baptized meeting on Sundays, when there were readings from "the Memoirs of the Apostles" (the Gospels) and the Prophets, a sermon of instruction, prayers for all classes of men, the kiss of peace, the presentation of bread and of wine and water, prayer and thanksgiving, to which the people responded "Amen," the distribution of the elements (which were not regarded as common bread and drink) to all those present, and (by the hands of the deacons) to the absent as well. It is a mere sketch of the way the Christians worshipped, made for the information of a heathen emperor, who would neither understand nor appreciate the details of the service; but it contains the general features of the liturgies which we find in use in all parts of Christendom one or two centuries later on; and, though the Bishop of each Church seems to have possessed the authority to improve his own liturgy by adding new ideas and rites, yet there is, as Bishop Barry says, "so remarkable a substantial unity that a normal structure in all can be plainly traced." "The conclusion is irresistible," he adds, "that these liturgies are developments, more or less independent, from a common original . . . which may have been preserved at first by oral traditions and may have passed, as the service became more elaborate, into written forms."

The *Apostolic Constitutions* (so called), a book which belongs to the fourth century, though it contains matter of a much earlier date, gives us a fairly detailed account of the service, and we have the lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem delivered in the year 347, in which he explains the latter part of the service to those who are about to be admitted to the "holy mysteries." From these and other sources it has been possible to draw a fairly accurate picture of the service as it was at that time.

A Service Fifteen Hundred Years Ago

The church is of a basilican type, which means that it is after the plan of the old Roman law-courts, oblong, with a semicircular apse at the end opposite the door. The floor within the apse and for a little way in front of it is raised somewhat, and at the centre of the chord of the arc stands a wooden altar covered with a white linen cloth, upon which nothing is placed but a two-handled chalice and a paten for bread. Over the altar is a canopy supported by four posts. Behind, against the curve of the wall, are seats for the clergy, the central one for the Bishop being higher than the others. The only other piece of furniture is the *ambo* or reader's desk at the right-hand side of the altar and nearer the people. There are no pews, for the congregation sit upon the floor when they are not standing or kneeling, and there is no font to be seen, for the baptistery is separate.

At the hour of service the people assemble in response to the sound of the *semantron* (which is a suspended piece of wood struck by a mallet) and take their places, the men on one side and the women on the other, and a reader goes to the *ambo* and reads a lesson from the Old Testament. Then follows one from the Epistles or Acts, and then the Gospel, a short psalm or anthem being sung between the lections. For the Gospel, which may not be read by anyone below the order of deacon, the people stand and the lights are lighted. St. Jerome, at the end of the fourth century, tells us: " When the Gospel is read, the candles are lighted, although the dawn may be reddening the sky, not, of course, to scatter the darkness, but by way of evidencing our joy."

After the Gospel follows the sermon, and if there are several priests present, each preaches in his turn, the Bishop coming last. It may be said in passing that there were many more bishops in the early Church in proportion to its size than we have now. The deacon directs all who are unbaptized or under discipline to depart, and only the faithful communicants are left. A Litany is then said, with petitions for the various conditions of persons in the Church, the people responding " Lord, have mercy," to each.

The Liturgy proper, the service of the faithful, then begins with the salutation " Peace be to all," and the response " and to thy spirit "; then follows the kiss of peace, the Eastern symbol of brotherly love, the clergy receiving it from the Bishop, the men of the congregation kissing each other, and the women the women.

The bread and wine are then brought, the deacons waving fans of peacock feathers to keep the flies away. The Bishop, whose position is behind the altar, facing the people, washes his hands as a symbol of purity and puts on his festal robes. " Let him put on his shining garments," the *Apostolic Constitutions* direct, " and stand at the altar and make the sign of the cross upon his forehead." Then after the mutual salutation he says " Lift up your hearts," and all respond " We lift them unto the Lord." " Let us give thanks unto the Lord," and the people answer " It is meet and right." The eucharistic prayer, the Thanksgiving, follows, reviewing the benefits of God conferred upon His creatures, the wonders of nature and of grace, and the types of the old covenant, culminating in the angelic hymn in which all join, " Holy, Holy, Holy," etc.

The Bishop then calls to mind the incarnation, the life and passion of Christ, reciting the Gospel account of the Last Supper, and praying that the Holy Spirit may make the bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ. This prayer of Consecration is followed or sometimes preceded by an intercession for the faithful, living and departed, to which the congregation respond "Amen," and the Lord's Prayer follows. Then is said "Holy things to the holy," with the response "One only is Holy, and One only is the Lord." The Communion follows, the priest putting the consecrated bread in the open right hand supported by the left and saying to each "The Body of Christ;" each replies "Amen." The deacon administers the Chalice, saying "The Blood of Christ, the cup of life," and during the Communion a psalm is sung. There follows a short thanksgiving; then the blessing is given by the Bishop, and the deacon bids the congregation depart in peace.

A Contrast with our Modern Services

It was some such service as that just described which constituted the "godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers" referred to in the Preface of the first English Prayer Book, and while there was no attempt to secure uniformity everywhere, the liturgies were so much alike that when Hosius went from Spain to Rome or Constantinople, Athanasius from Egypt to Gaul or Northern Germany, Basil from Cæsarea to Armenia, or Augustine from Milan to North Africa, each would find the same familiar service.

It may be noted that the services of the early Church were much fuller and longer than that of our Prayer

Book. The demand for short services is a thing of Western and of modern growth. At the present day Eastern services frequently last over three hours, and the accumulation of Morning Prayer, Litany and Holy Communion, which was met with in many places in the Anglican Church fifty years ago, and which originated in the injunctions of Archbishop Grindal in Queen Elizabeth's reign, would better represent the worship of the early Church than our own brief order of Holy Communion.

Compare our short eucharistic thanksgiving, " It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty," etc, with that of the liturgy of Sarapion, who was an Egyptian bishop about A.D. 350: " It is meet and right to praise, to hymn, to glorify Thee, the uncreated Father of the only-begotten Jesus Christ. We praise Thee, O uncreated God, who art unsearchable, ineffable, incomprehensible by any created substance. We praise Thee, who art known of Thine only-begotten Son, who through Him art spoken of and interpreted and made known to created nature. We praise Thee who knowest the Son and revealest to the saints the glories that are about Him; who art known of Thy begotten Word, and art brought to the sight and interpreted to the understanding of the saints. We praise Thee, O Father unseen, Provider of immortality. Thou art the Fount of life, the Fount of light, the Fount of all grace and truth, O Lover of men, Lover of the poor, who reconcilest Thyself to all, and drawest all to Thyself through the advent of Thy beloved Son. Make us, we beseech Thee, living men. Give us a spirit of light that we may know Thee, the true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. Give us Holy Spirit that we may be able to tell forth and to enunciate Thy unspeakable mysteries. May the Lord Jesus and Holy Spirit speak in us and hymn Thee through us.

"For Thou art far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but in that which is to come. Beside Thee stand a thousand thousand, yea ten thousand times ten thousand angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities and powers: by Thee stand the two most honourable six-winged seraphim, with two wings covering the face, with two the feet, and with two flying, and hallowing Thee; with whom receive also our ascription of holiness as we say: Holy, holy, holy, Lord of hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory."

A Thousand Years of Development

It is not necessary to our purpose to follow the development of the public services of the Church. Each age, quite naturally, differed from the preceding one in its ideas of religious expression as in other things. After the rivalry between Constantinople and Rome had culminated in the great schism of East and West, the two great branches of the Church had little influence upon each other, and they developed each in its own way. "The East," says Freeman, "soars to God in exclamations of angelic self-forgetfulness"—of which the Thanksgiving just quoted is a good example—"the West comprehends all spiritual needs of men in Collects of matchless profundity. . . . The East praises, the West pleads, the one has fixed her eye more intently on the glory-throne of Christ, the other on His Cross."

While the Western services followed a common type, they varied in different places. Rome, Milan, Gaul and Spain, each had its own peculiarities, but as time went on, and the power and influence of Rome increased, there was a tendency to assimilate Roman ideas, though not so much as is commonly supposed.

When Augustine came to establish his mission in England in 597 he found a remnant of the British Church there, using a liturgy very much like that in use in France. He wrote to Pope Gregory, who had sent him, asking whether he should follow the British usage or the Roman, to which he had been accustomed. Gregory very wisely advised him to take from each such things as he thought best adapted to the minds and customs of the English. The result was that the English services were of a somewhat mixed character, chiefly Roman, but with certain non-Roman features, and such they continued up to the time that the Book of Common Prayer was drawn up.

CHAPTER II

OF THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

Conditions in the Sixteenth Century

DURING the thousand years in which the Western services were developing the changes were not always for good. There was much done in the way of liturgical enrichment, and some of the most beautiful features of our Prayer Book worship belong to that period, particularly the Collects, more than a score of which are taken from the Sacramentary of Gelasius, who lived at the end of the fifth century, and as many more from that of Gregory a century later; and a number of beautiful hymns were incorporated into the services between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries. But corruptions crept in as well. The withholding the Cup in Holy Communion; the neglect of Communion, resulting from the idea that it was sufficient to be present at the celebration of the " Mass " (as the eucharistic service was called) without communicating; the extravagant devotion paid to the Blessed Virgin Mary and other saints; the breaking up of parts of the service for the sake of the music in such a way as to obscure the meaning—all these were abuses which called for remedy. And besides this, most of the services were in Latin, which only the educated could understand. To be sure, those who were well instructed could follow the service of the Mass by sight, but they could not do this with the Canonical Hours, which were said daily at set times, at least, in all Cathedral and monastic churches, and consisted of Psalms, Prayers, Lessons and Hymns. For those who could read, however, there were " Primers " containing, amongst other things, services in English arranged on similar lines to the Latin Hours. These little books were put forth—to begin with in manuscript—a hundred and fifty years before our Prayer Book was compiled; so the people were not altogether without prayers in their own tongue.

Substituting English for Latin

The greatest need of the Church of England at the beginning of the sixteenth century was an English Bible. Wiclif's version, made in the fourteenth century, existed only in manuscript, and it was full of obsolete phrases which would hardly have been intelligible in the sixteenth century; but the invention of printing made it easy to multiply books, and scholars prepared English translations for the press. In 1539 the *Great Bible* was issued and ordered to be set up in the churches, and people met together to hear it read, though at first this reading formed no part of the regular services. In 1543, however, Convocation ordered that " every Sunday and Holy-Day throughout the year the curate of every parish church, after the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat*, should openly read unto the people one chapter of the New Testament in English without exposition; and when the New Testament was read over, then to begin the Old."

Tyndale's Bible, the text of which was followed for the most part in the Great Bible, had been prohibited, not on account of the translation itself, but because notes of various kinds, in many cases containing unsound doctrine, were incorporated with it.

The next step towards services in English was the drawing up of the Litany by Archbishop Cranmer in 1544. This was substantially the same as that in our Prayer Book to-day, but it had three invocations, to "St. Mary, Mother of God," to "Angels and Archangels," to "All holy patriarchs, and prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors and virgins, and all the blessed company of heaven," to "pray for us," and amongst its petitions was one for deliverance "from the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities." The Primers had contained a form of Litany long before this, to be used in processions, when "beating the bounds" of the parishes and upon other occasions, but this was the first officially prescribed for public use. It was customary to sing the Litany, as the Prayer Book still directs as an alternative to saying it, and when Cranmer submitted his draft to the King, he suggested that His Majesty should "command some devout and solemn note to be made thereunto," and the same year a harmonized version was set forth to the old music which is still used in most churches where the Litany is sung. John Marbecke, whose name is well known to all lovers of Church music, especially for his beautiful melody set to the Nicene Creed, was organist to the Chapels Royal at this time. He was a zealous reformer and narrowly escaped being burned at the stake in Mary's reign.

No further progress was made in the alteration of the services so long as Henry VIII lived, for he was uncompromisingly opposed to any change of doctrine, and exhibited little willingness for liturgical reform; but he died in 1547, and Edward VI, a precocious youth of ten, who was in the hands of unscrupulous advisers, succeeded to the throne. Convocation at once authorized the administration of Holy Communion in both kinds, and appointed a commission for revising the Church services. In 1548 they issued a temporary *Order of Communion*, which introduced into the Latin service, after the communion of the priest, the Invitation, Confession, Exhortation, Absolution and Comfortable Words in almost their present form—Words of Administration similar to the first half of those we have now, and the Peace, without the blessing now attached to it.

The Prayer Book Commission and its Work

No accurate information has come down to us as to the *personnel* of the Commission which drafted the first Prayer Book; but it was a very representative body consisting of men of all parties in the Church. On the one hand was Thirlby, afterwards first and only Bishop of Westminster, who was a staunch Papist, and on the other hand was Bishop Ridley of Rochester, a leading reformer, while Cranmer, who was in the chair, whatever else may be said of him, was a learned man, loyal to Holy Scripture and the early Fathers, and a good liturgical scholar. Heylin (1662) [1] notes that it was resolved that " none but English heads or hands should be used therein; lest otherwise it might be thought, and perhaps objected, that they rather followed the example of some other Churches or were swayed by the authority of these foreign assistants," and he adds that Calvin offered his assistance, but Cranmer refused the offer.

---

[1] Dates immediately following a name are those of the year of death.

The Commission did not set out to effect a revolution, but, as Dean Luckock expresses it, "Their aim was restoration, and in the process of obtaining it they exercised the most careful discrimination between the old and the new, and, while cutting away without hesitation the later overgrowths, preserved with scrupulous care the ancient landmarks." This is what Bishop Jeremy Taylor meant when he offered to prove that the Prayer Book was the same that had been used in the Church for fifteen hundred years. And Nichols (1712) says "Neither did anyone at home or abroad (the envy, ill-nature, heterodoxy of Calvin only excepted) charge us in the least with any remains of Popish leaven, as mixt with our services and orders, or anything that looked that way."

The alteration in the *Divine Service* (as the series of offices for the Canonical Hours was called) was not so great as would at first appear. It is true that the *Breviary*, which was the book containing the Psalms, Lessons, Hymns, Collects, etc., of which the Divine Service consisted, contained forms to be said at fixed times—Mattins (with Lauds) at daybreak, Prime, Terce, Sext, Nones at six, nine, twelve, and three o'clock respectively, Evensong (or Vespers) before sunset, and Compline at bedtime—but it was only in very strict monasteries that these hours were observed. The laity had no part in them, and the clergy were accustomed to relieve the pressure by saying two or three of the offices together. "The people," says Dr. Frere, "were accustomed and also greatly attached to the Sunday services of Mattins, Mass and Evensong, but in practice the pre-Reformation congregation did not expect to follow every point of the services. The people knew little of the Breviary Hours except for Sundays." Most of the Hours services had fixed Psalms, and it was only to Mattins that Bible Lessons were attached. What Cranmer did was to alter these services in the direction of simplicity, arranging that the Psalter should be said through once a month, and providing for the systematic reading of Old and New Testament Lessons.

The First English Prayer Book

The work of the Commission was finished and the new book was presented to the Convocation and approved in November 1548, and it was directed that it should come into general use on Whitsunday (June 9th) of the following year. Unfortunately this direction was enforced by an Act of Uniformity passed in January. The interference of civil authorities in spiritual matters, attempting to rule the Church by Acts of Parliament, has always failed, from the passing of the Statute on *the Burning of Hereticks* in 1401 to the *Public Worship Regulation Act* of 1874, and Nonconformity in England owes its origin to resistance to Acts of Uniformity.

The abolition of diocesan "Uses" (peculiarities of custom regulated by individual bishops) by common agreement, so that "from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one Use," was a convenient and sensible arrangement, but the attempt to force men by civil penalties to obey the regulations for public worship led almost inevitably to opposition and rebellion.

But what was the book like which the labours of the Commission produced? That it should be in every way perfect would be too much to expect; but it was certainly one of the most remarkable handbooks of public worship ever brought forth, and was " clothed in English, the beauty of which has rarely been equalled and never surpassed, even in the best age of literary excellence." Archbishop Cranmer—for we may safely accept the tradition that his was the master-hand in the work—was more than a mere translator. He enriched and beautified the terse Latin of the venerable Collects as he rendered them into English in a way that has won the admiration and given satisfactory expression to the devotion of every generation since his day.

Observe the title-page: " *The Book of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the Use of the Church of England.*" What had been scattered over several volumes before—the *Breviary* for the Divine Service, the *Missal* for the service of the Mass, the *Manual* for the Occasional Offices—was here gathered into one volume, so that, as the Preface says, " the curates shall need none other books for their public service, but this book and the Bible." The Psalter was not included in the book, for the Psalms were read from the Great Bible then in use, and so well fitted was its diction for liturgical use that this version is still retained in our Prayer Books.

It is not necessary to examine in detail the peculiarities of the Prayer Book of 1549, but its general features may be noted. The Services of Morning and Evening Prayer, which were entitled *Mattins* and *Evensong* respectively, began with the Lord's Prayer and ended with the Third Collect. With the Collects, Epistles and Gospels were printed selected Psalms to be sung as *Introits*. The word Introit means *entrance*, and the custom can be traced back to the fifth century of singing an anthem of some kind as the priest entered the chancel for the celebration of Holy Communion. The arrangement of the service for "Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass," was different from that of our present Prayer Book, following the ancient order. The Prayer for the whole estate of Christ's Church, the Consecration Prayer, the Prayer of Oblation ("O Lord, our Heavenly Father," etc.) and the Lord's Prayer were grouped together, and then followed the preparation and Communion almost exactly as in the English part of the Order of Communion of 1548. At Baptism the child was clothed with a "white vesture" commonly called the *Chrisome*, as a token of innocency; in Confirmation there was no renewal of Baptismal Vows; in the Visitation of the Sick there was a form of anointing to be used if the sick person should desire it, and at Burial there was a commendation of the soul to God, as the body was committed to the ground. At the end of the book were "Certain notes for the more plain Explication and decent Ministration of things contained in this Book," one of which was: "As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures: they may be used or left, as every man's devotion serveth, without blame." The forms for Ordination were not included in the book, but were published in 1550 and not added to the Prayer Book until 1552.

The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI

The first Prayer Book was launched in evil times. A deliberate *propaganda* had been undertaken for the purpose of reducing the ancient Church of England to the amorphous condition of Continental Protestantism. Dr. Bernard, formerly Archbishop of Dublin, and afterwards Provost of Trinity College, said at the Shrewsbury Church Congress: "The excesses of that horde of foreigners and godly adventurers which managed to get hold of the political machine under Edward VI left little reason to doubt that even a brief extension of their terrible government would have completed the ruin of the Church of England." Calvin and Melanchthon corresponded with Cranmer. They succeeded in getting Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer appointed to Divinity Professorships at Oxford and Cambridge respectively; John Knox was made a Royal Chaplain, and John à Lasco, a refugee from Germany, was made superintendent of the foreign Protestant congregation in London; for England was then, as ever, the refuge of those restless spirits who were denied the liberty in their own countries which was freely extended to them there. These all disapproved of the first Prayer Book and used their influence to have it set aside. À Lasco, who seems to have been a man of engaging personality, was Cranmer's guest for six months, and he so ingratiated himself with the boy King that (like a true Tudor) Edward declared that if Convocation would not authorize the revision of the Prayer Book he would refer the matter to Parliament. Convocation did not give its approval to the scheme and the second Prayer Book had only the authority of Parliament. Yet the second Act of Uniformity, so far from cursing the first book in such terms as Calvin would have desired, blessed it altogether as " a very godly order . . . agreeable to the word of God and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian Conversation, and most profitable to the state of this Realm."

The revision was made and the new book was ordered to come into use on All Saints' Day, 1552, but no order was given for calling in the former books, and as Edward died in July 1553, it is certain the second book never came into general use. It is of great interest, however, in that it was the basis of further revisions. The principal changes may be noted. In Morning and Evening Prayer the Sentences, Exhortations and Absolution were prefixed. The Commandments were inserted in the Communion Office, the Introits omitted, and the general arrangement so altered as to put it at variance with all other liturgies, particularly in dissociating the Prayer of Oblation from the Consecration Prayer and placing it after the Communion. The Lord's Prayer, which always followed the Prayer of Consecration, was placed after the communion of the people; the prayer for the Holy Spirit was left out, and the prayer of Humble Access, instead of immediately preceding the Communion, was placed before the prayer of Consecration. A declaration on kneeling, known as the " Black

Rubric," was subsequently drawn up by the Council, not by the Archbishop, and inserted in some copies on a fly-leaf.

"Thus against the Archbishop's will," says Dr. Frere, "and without the consent of the Church, English religion reached its low-water mark and the ill-starred book of 1552 began its brief career." Yet even of this book Calvin said, "it contained many relics of the dregs of popery," and demanded "something more refined from filth and rustiness."

From 1553 *to* 1662

It is only necessary to touch lightly upon the further revisions of the Prayer Book, for the structural changes were not very great; but a general glance at the conditions of the time is necessary to the right understanding of the limitations of these revisions. The accession of Queen Mary, disastrous as it was for England, at least seemed providential in saving the Church from impending calamity. The foreign Protestants fled precipitately to the Continent, and unfortunately a number of Englishmen went with them. There were others, however, who dreading, as Luckock says, "the association of foreign churches more than contact with Rome, determined to remain in England, some of them conforming to the Roman worship and retaining their posts, others, whose consciences were tender, resigning their livings and retiring into privacy, contented to bide their time and hope for better days." These were men of the type of Matthew Parker, whom Elizabeth chose as Archbishop of Canterbury, and with these the less violent of the exiles united on their return. In strong contrast to the full liberty which was given à Lasco and his followers in London to order their services as they chose, the English congregation at Frankfort were required to set aside the Prayer Book and follow the usages of the French Protestants there. Some did this willingly; others contended for the Prayer Book services.

Elizabeth, when she came to the throne in 1559, found herself in a trying position. The Romanist party was in power, and the exiles, thinking that their turn had now come, returned by hundreds, and insisted that the Church should be modelled after their ideas. Thus English Churchmanship was in danger of being crushed between the upper and nether mill-stones of Popery and Puritanism. The Queen herself would have liked to restore the first Prayer Book, but the Puritan opposition was too strong, and the book of 1552 was adopted, with some conservative alterations, but it was by no means loyally accepted, and Archbishop Parker found it practically impossible to secure the *minimum* observance of the use of the surplice and kneeling at Holy Communion. Several attempts were made in Parliament during Elizabeth's reign to secure a revision in the Puritan interests, but they were unsuccessful.

On the accession of James I, however, in 1603 the hopes of the Puritans revived and they petitioned the King that their grievances might be redressed, with the result that the Hampton Court Conference was called and the question in dispute discussed by representatives of both parties. A few alterations were made in the Prayer Book and some new prayers added, but the chief result of the Conference was the appointment of a

Commission to prepare a new translation of the Bible, which produced the (so-called) *Authorized Version* of 1611.

Everyone knows the story of the Great Rebellion, when the Puritans triumphed and established what they called " the true reformed Protestant religion." They deprived the Bishops of their sees—Laud was beheaded, and Wren (of Norwich) kept in prison for nineteen years—the use of the Prayer Book, even in private, was made a crime, and the *Directory of Public Worship* was ordered to be used instead. After the death of Cromwell came a reaction. Charles II was recalled from exile, and the nation felt as much relief in getting rid of Puritan tyranny as it had done in getting rid of the papal tyranny under Mary. The new King was promptly beset by the Puritans to grant them the liberty which they had denied to loyal Churchmen, and Charles so far yielded as to summon the Savoy Conference. Richard Baxter, a Puritan divine, " with no other help than his Bible and Concordance," drew up in a fortnight a book of services to take the place of the Prayer Book, and this, says, Luckock, " he did not scruple to propose as a substitute for one which had grown with the Church's growth, and rooted itself in the hearts and affections of the people." The leading Churchman at the Conference was Cosin, Bishop of Durham, " almost without a rival in any age for acquaintance with liturgical lore, the decrees of Councils and Patristic teaching." A large number of minor changes were made, including some new Collects, the restoration of a commemoration of the departed to the Prayer for the Church, a service for Adult Baptism, rendered necessary " by the growth of Anabaptism," and the restoration of the "Black Rubric," removing, however, the denial of the "real and essential" presence and substituting "corporal presence." Cosin's "Notes" indicate that the revision would have been more thorough had not the Commission felt restricted by their instructions "to avoid all unnecessary alterations."

Since 1662

A few words may be added here concerning attempts at revision subsequent to 1662. First came that of 1689, which aimed at recasting the Prayer Book so as to make it acceptable to the Dissenters. This was a signal failure. The Scottish Communion Service was drawn up in 1636, but the conditions were such that it could not then come into use. It was formally adopted in 1731 and authorised as an alternative to the English Service. The two are now printed in the Prayer Book for use in Scotland; but the Scottish Liturgy stands first, and it seems to be steadily growing in favour. A revision of the Scottish book was finished in 1928 and published in 1929. After the American Revolution a revision of services was necessary in America, and, following the consecration of Dr. Seabury as first American Bishop by the Scottish Bishops in 1784, there came about, through his influence, the adoption (in its main features) of the Scottish Liturgy. The first American revision was published in 1789. Another revision was undertaken in 1880 and completed in 1892. This in turn was found unsatisfactory and a further revision was undertaken in 1916, the greater part of which was authorized by the General Convention of 1925, the rest being left over for confirmation in 1928; the new book was published in 1929. The Irish Church, disestablished in 1871, brought out a revised Prayer Book in 1878, which was slightly revised again in 1926, the book being published in 1927; and the Canadian Church brought out a Revision in 1921. The Church in South Africa put forth a Revision of the Communion Service for experimental use, which was finally approved as an Alternative Rite in 1929. A revision of the occasional offices is being tried in the same way. References to all these will be found throughout this book.

In England a Royal Commission was appointed by King Edward VII to inquire into the question of Ecclesiastical Discipline, and its report, presented in 1906, stated that the existing law regarding public worship was "too narrow for the present generation." The Crown then issued Letters of Business to the Convocations, directing them to propose such modifications as they should think desirable. The result of their deliberations was the Revised Prayer Book of 1927, technically known as "*The Deposited Book.*" This book, approved by the Bishops with only four dissentient voices, and endorsed by both Convocations, by every diocese in England, and by the Church Assembly, was submitted to Parliament and approved by the House of Lords, but defeated in the House of Commons in December 1927. Then some changes were made by the Bishops, chiefly in the way of further restrictions concerning Reservation, and the book was again presented to the House of Commons, and again rejected in June 1928. On both occasions there was a majority of English members in favour of the measure. The book was published in December 1928 under the title of "The Prayer Book as proposed in 1928," and is generally known as the 1928 Prayer Book. In 1929 the Bishops agreed to adopt this book as a standard by which to judge deviations from the 1662 Book; that is to say, the 1662 Book remains the legal standard of worship, and if clergy wish to vary from it, with the approval of the Bishops and the goodwill of their Parochial Church Council, they may adopt features of the 1928 Book. This policy was approved by the Convocations in July 1929.

Never in the Church's history has so much time and attention been given to the preparation of a Prayer Book, and, whatever its future may be, the 1928 Book will always be of great historical and devotional interest. Before it was completed it had largely affected the American Revision, and there is no doubt that it will exercise a corresponding influence upon future overseas revisions where Parliaments do not interfere with worship and the Liturgy is not "by law established."

CHAPTER III

OF THE PRELIMINARY MATTER

The Title-page

THE book which we commonly call the Prayer Book is more than that name implies. Its full title is a very long one:—" *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of England; together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches; and the Form or Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons.*" But even this does not tell all that is in the book, for it is customary to include in the English book the Accession Service, the Articles of Religion, and the Table of Kindred and Affinity, while both the Canadian and American books have Consecrations, Thanksgiving Services, Family Prayers and other supplementary matter. Thus there is an extensive collection of material gathered together in this one volume.

First, note particularly the wording of the Title. " The Book of Common Prayer " means the book which we use when we say our prayers in Common or in Public. When Cranmer alludes in his Preface to " the Common Prayers in the Church, commonly called *Divine Service*," he would seem to refer particularly to the Morning and Evening Prayer, which represent the offices for the Hours, formerly known as the Divine

Service. "The Administration of the Sacraments" points to the Offices for Baptism and Holy Communion, while the "other Rites and Ceremonies" would refer to Confirmation, Matrimony, Burial and Churching. Rites and Ceremonies are not the same. A rite is a form of service, and a ceremony is an action accompanying it. Thus the Solemnization of Matrimony is a rite: the giving and receiving of a ring is a ceremony. The Burial of the Dead is a rite: the casting of earth upon the body is a ceremony.

Note the phrase "Sacraments . . . Rites and Ceremonies of the Church." It is our claim to Catholicity. These are not things which belong to the English Church. They belong to the whole Church, but are here set forth "according to the Use of the Church of England." The Prayer Book speaks in this way throughout. Our interests are never limited to the Anglican Communion. We are taught always that we are members of that great brotherhood of Christians which is the Catholic Church. The newly-baptized child is received "into the congregation of Christ's flock," not into the Anglican Church; in the Creed we confess our faith in the "Holy Catholic Church"; in the Litany we pray for "thy holy Church universal" and in the Prayer for All Sorts and Conditions of Men, for "the good estate of the Catholic Church." Then there is the prayer for "the whole estate of Christ's Church." Those who come to be ordained are admitted first "to execute the office of a Deacon [not in our own particular communion, but] in the Church of God," and so also "for the office . . . of a Priest, in the Church of God." "This thy family" in the first Good Friday

Collect means more than a particular local Church, and so does " the whole body of the Church " in the Collect following.

One word more before we leave the Title-page—the Psalms are " pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches." It implies that singing is the preferable way. The pointing means the colon in the middle of each verse. The Psalms were written to be sung, and were sung in the Temple and Synagogue services, and also in the Christian Church from earliest times. They are part of the offering of praise to Almighty God. But where they cannot be sung they may be said.

The Prefaces

The prefatory matter of the Prayer Book is only of secondary importance, and yet there are things here which are useful as showing the principles which underlie the Prayer Book. The Preface of 1662 admits the lawfulness of making changes " according to the various exigency of times and occasions," provided " the main Body and Essentials . . . have still continued the same." Some of the Puritan objections were to things essential. They not only wanted to do away with the surplice and the sign of the Cross: they would have abolished Bishops; they would have abolished Confirmation. Frivolous objections, the Revisers state, had been ignored, and such alterations as they thought " in any degree requisite or expedient " they assented unto.

In the Preface of 1549, which now bears the title " *Concerning the Service of the Church*," the most notable thing is the appeal to history, which is characteristic of the English Church, but not of foreign Protestant bodies. Three times we find such an appeal in this Preface. First it is, " this godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers ": again, " the ancient Fathers have divided the Psalms," etc.; and again, " here you have an Order for Prayer, and for the reading of the holy Scripture, much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers." We find the same appeal in the Preface to the Ordinal: " It is evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors." A Canon of Queen Elizabeth's time (1571) directed: " The Preachers chiefly shall take heed that they teach nothing in their preaching, which they would have the people religiously to observe and believe, but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old Testament and the New, and that which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have gathered out of their doctrine;" and Bernard Gilpin, a well-known priest of that time, wrote: " I propounded to myself this course; first of all to search the Scriptures diligently, and to be acquainted with the expositions of the Fathers upon them."

At the end of this Preface are the directions for the daily use of the Divine Service by the clergy, which are even stricter now than they were in the earlier editions. In 1549 it was only such clergy as " served congregations " who were bound to say Morning and Evening Prayer, but now the use of these daily Prayers is of obligation upon all Priests and Deacons, and every Parish Priest is to say them publicly in Church, " not being otherwise reasonably hindered." The bell is to be rung that the people may come " to hear God's Word and to pray with him "; but, if that is not possible, the sound of the bell reminds them that the prayers and praises are going up in their behalf. "Good reason it is," says Bishop Sparrow, one of the revisers of the Prayer Book of 1662, "that this sweet-smelling savour should be daily offered up to God Morning and Evening, whereby God may be pacified and invited to dwell amongst His people. And whatsoever the world think, thus to be the Lord's Remembrancers, putting Him in mind of the people's wants, being as it were Angels of the Lord, interceding for the people, and carrying up the daily prayers of the Church in their behalf, is one of the most useful and principal parts of the Priest's office."

The section "*Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained,*" stood at the end of the first Prayer Book. It sets forth the necessity of having some ceremonies, and maintains that it is better to retain the old than to bring in new ones. The Prayer Book does not set down in detail how everything is to be done. Custom and common sense must guide us in things not prescribed. But it condemns "wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order" as "no small offence before God." No man may be a law unto himself. It would lead to endless confusion if every priest were free to do as he thought best. He is bound by the conditions of his ordination to do as the Prayer Book directs. The matter will be found more strongly put in the XXXIVth Article.

The Preface to the English Book of 1928 lays stress on the changed conditions of modern life, which demand more freedom of worship. It denies that any change of doctrine as regards the Holy Communion is intended.

"In all things we have set before our eyes the duty of faithfulness to the teaching of Scripture and the godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers."

Must we follow the Rubrics?

It may be well here to discuss the question of the binding character of rubrics, and how far it is possible to attain that "provision for greater elasticity in public worship" which was declared desirable in a resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1908. It is obvious that if the clergy should feel themselves at liberty to do each as he might think best we should be brought to endless confusion. Not only is it perplexing to the laity when they see the services are not carried out as according to the directions of the Prayer Book they should be carried out, but it seems to be a direct breach of the "Declaration of Assent," made by every priest and deacon at his ordination, when he solemnly promises: "In Public Prayers and administration of the Sacraments I will use the Form in the said Book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

Archdeacon Sharp (1758), who for many years was regarded as the leading authority in such matters, said in a charge to the clergy: "We are under higher obligation to observe rubric than any other ecclesiastical law whatsoever," and he expressed strong disapproval of anyone that "shall presume to innovate, or vary the form and practice therein prescribed him." There are, however, he admitted, some necessary limitations and reservations. The bishops at Lambeth (1908) recognized widely prevalent customs, "which fail to comply with the strict requirements of the rubrics," as in many cases desirable, and they recommended in such cases that the rubrics should be brought as far as possible into line with general practice. Dr. Sharp's contention is that the rubric is statute as well as canon law, and so is doubly binding. This is at least questioned. Canon Lacey in his *Handbook of Church Law* says of rubrics: "There are some who treat them as positive law. This extreme position seems to be refuted by the history of the rubric, both name and thing. The name was first applied to the abstracts of chapters and marginal references in books of Civil Law, which were written in red ink expressly that they might be distinguished from the authentic text; it was afterwards applied to similar notes in ritual books." Again he says: "The rubrics are first-rate evidence of what is obligatory . . . some refer to an ideal that was never attained, and some to a state of things that is obsolete;" and, dealing with the contention that they have the force of statute law because the Prayer Book was attached to the Act of Uniformity, he says: "The book was annexed as a whole, and must be interpreted simply as a ritual book with its usual limitations." Dr. Frere notes that "the rubric provided in the first Prayer Book of 1549 was unusually meagre. This was partly owing to the fact that the book was an effort to prescribe for the parish church rather than for the collegiate or cathedral church. It was also due to the fact that law of public worship was in a state of great change: new directions were being constantly given by royal or episcopal authority, and all was in a state of flux."

Certainly the rubrics are not a sufficient guide, and anyone unfamiliar with our services would hardly gather from the rubrical directions how they are to be conducted. Look at the opening rubric in the Daily Office: "*At the beginning of Morning Prayer the Minister shall read with a loud voice*," etc. Is he to read it from the pulpit, or from the chancel steps, or from the altar, or where? Is he to sit, or stand, or kneel? Is he to wear a surplice, or cope, or black gown? The rubric is silent on these points. We simply follow traditional usage. The general direction on the page preceding the Office tells us that it "shall be used in the accustomed place." We are referred back to custom. Again, mention is made of "*Quires and places where they sing*," but this raises a number of questions. Where is the choir to be placed?—in the chancel, or in a gallery at the west end of the Church? Are the choristers to be men and boys, or may we have mixed choirs? How are they to be dressed?—in ordinary clothes or in some special garments? Are they to take their places one by one, as the members of the congregation do, or shall they enter with the minister?—and, if the latter way, may they come in quietly to the strains of an organ voluntary, or is the idea now widely prevalent a right one, that a choir can only be brought in or taken out while singing a hymn? Again on all these points there is no rubric to guide us. It is well that we should have liberty in such matters, if we use it with discretion. The rubric before the Psalms merely directs that they shall follow as they are appointed. Are the people to sit (as some do now) or are they to stand? Where is the direction that minister and people shall read alternate verses? It is custom, not rubric, that we follow. A dozen other things might be mentioned to show that the rubrics are not designed to tell us everything that is to be done, and yet there are good people who maintain that omission is prohibition, and it is wrong to do anything which the rubric does not direct.

The *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline* (1906), which is a very interesting document, states, not of course as any justification of irregularities, but as a fact which cannot be ignored, that "as a matter of history, deviations from the standards set up by Acts of Uniformity can be shown not only to have existed but also to have been tolerated in every period since the Act of Uniformity of 1559. . . . Some were additions to the ceremonies or ornaments connected with public worship, some were omissions. Some have been changes demanded by general convenience if not necessity; some have been the outcome of mere negligence."

But if the rubrics may in some cases be ignored, and in other cases are insufficient, what guide is the minister to follow? Is he simply to exercise his own judgment? It has been well said that "what was left to the discretion of the minister was also left to his indiscretion." It is just here that the bishop's authority comes in. Let it be recognised first that to follow the letter of the rubric is always safe: to deviate from it is only justifiable (*a*) by a generally accepted custom, which does not, however, mean that if a number of priests violate the rubric with impunity, others are at liberty to do the same; (*b*) by necessity, which knows no law; or (*c*) by the dispensation of the bishop of the diocese.

The Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church" tells us that for the settling of any doubts that may arise "the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, [contained in this Book] shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this book." The *Report of the Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, above referred to, states that "a claim has been advanced that a power resides in each Diocesan Bishop to control the public services of the churches in his diocese, and to authorize additions and omissions therein, to an extent which no witness has exactly defined. . . . This right, under the name of *jus liturgicum*, was claimed definitely by at least two bishops." These were Dr. John Wordsworth, the learned Bishop of Salisbury, and Dr. Talbot, then Bishop of Winchester.

That such a right was exercised by the bishops of early days cannot be questioned. In Bingham's *Antiquities* (1710) we read that "though there was but one form of worship throughout the whole Church, as to what concerned the substance of Christian worship; yet every bishop was at liberty to form his own liturgy in what method and words he thought proper, only keeping to the analogy of faith and sound doctrine." On the other hand, it is contended that the bishops of the Church of England surrendered this right when they agreed upon the Book of Common Prayer. To some extent this is certainly true; yet, if that right was inherent in the office, it is difficult to understand how those bishops could have deprived their successors of its exercise for all time to come. The limitation which must be put upon this right is that, where there is an accepted form, individual bishops may not order anything either to be done or to be omitted which is contrary to the form prescribed. Dr. Lacey says: "By custom a bishop may make certain regulations, as in regard to details of divine worship (*jus liturgicum*), without synodical publicity. It is considered that an order so made lapses with the removal of the bishop making it."

One thing is certain: no priest (still less a deacon) in his public ministrations may take liberties with the rules of the Prayer Book without due authority. To quote a sentence from *A Bishop's Letters:* "There must be strict adherence to the principle that nothing shall be done in public worship which is not expressly authorised for such use by a competent authority in the Church."

The Christian Year

The Tables of Lessons, the Calendar, the Tables of Festivals and Fasts, and other like tables are all connected with the Christian Year, and the question perhaps arises, Why should we observe special days and seasons? Anyone who has read *Evelyn's Diary*, which tells of conditions in England in the days of Puritan rule, will remember how the keeping of Christmas was forbidden under severe penalties, and how Oliver Cromwell, "in contradiction to all custom and decency," feasted at the Lord Mayor's in London on Ash Wednesday; but there is not much of that spirit to-day, except that thoughtless people take advantage of the civil holiday on Good Friday to make it a day for sport and enjoyment. The festivals and seasons prescribed under the Law were meant to keep in mind God's special mercies to His people Israel, and we, who are partakers of greater mercies under the Gospel, ought to be no less careful to keep these in mind. This is how it is expressed in Bishop Sparrow's *Rationale :* "The remembrance of the Birth, the Sufferings, the Resurrection of Christ, the Coming of the Holy Ghost, the Conversion of the Gentiles by sending the Apostles, the way made before His coming by the Annunciation of the Angel and the coming of the Baptist, as it is a powerful mean to train the more ignorant sort in the understanding of such great mysteries, so it is a just occasion for all sorts to make that a particular time of serving God upon which we solemnize those great works of His." In other words, the Christian Year ensures that in the Prayer Book services the people shall have the whole Gospel set before them, which they are not sure of from the pulpit.

The Christian Calendar began with the observance of Sunday as the *Lord's Day*—the weekly memorial of His Resurrection. Friday too, from a very early period, if not from the first, was kept as a fast in memory of the Crucifixion.

The sacredness of special days comes not from their being the exact days on which the facts that we commemorate took place, but from their acceptance by the Church as suitable days for such commemoration—much in the same way as people accept national holidays, though (strictly speaking) *holiday* means *holy day.*

We have no accurate knowledge as to the day on which Christ was born, but the festival of His birth was observed at least as far back as the fourth century on

December 25th in the West. In the East the festival of His coming (the Epiphany) was observed on January 6th as early as the third century. Eventually the Church adopted both days. Easter, of course, varies in its date from March 22nd to April 24th, and all the movable feasts and fasts depend upon it. Tables for finding Easter, giving the Golden Number, the Epact and Sunday Letter, have been inserted in the English Prayer Book since 1752, but they are of little practical use now. A brief explanation of the terms, however, may fitly be given here without going into mathematical details.

About 432 B.C. an astronomer of Athens, named Meton, discovered that every nineteenth year the full moon fell on the same day of the month, and from this fact it was possible to assign a number to each year showing its position in the cycle, and these were called the *Golden Numbers*, because they were marked in gold in the ancient calenders. The year 1 A.D. was the second year of the Metonic cycle, so if you add 1 to the number of any year, and divide by 19, the remainder will be the Golden Number for that year. From this you can reckon the day of the Easter full moon. But Easter must be on a Sunday, and the letters A, B, C, D, E, F, G are set to the days of the week beginning January 1st, and (except in leap year) the letter which marks the day on which the first Sunday falls will be the *Sunday Letter* for the year. In leap year there are two letters, one for January and February and the succeeding letter for the rest of the year.

If you take the number of the year (*e.g.* 1929) and add its fourth part for the number of leap years, the sum will give you the accumulation of extra days (for each year has one day over 52 weeks) since B.C. I. Divide by seven and the odd days left over will move the Sunday Letter backwards from A, so that if this year it is G, next year it will be F. Thus the Golden Number enables you to find the Paschal Moon, and the Sunday Letter shows how many days to add to find Easter Day. The *Epact* means added days, and is a substitute for the Golden Number introduced in the Roman Breviary in 1582, but is not included in our directions for finding Easter. Reckoning 29½ days for the lunar months we get 354 days for the 12 months, which is 11 days short of the solar year of 365 days. In reckoning the Epact of any particular year the number of days is counted from the last new moon of the previous year to January 1st, which may vary from 0 to 28. Why the Epacts are given in the Prayer Book is not clear.

A proposal for a fixed Easter—probably the second Sunday in April—has recently met with considerable favour, and is under serious consideration by the ecclesiastical authorities of the East and West. This would give uniformly four Sundays after Epiphany each year, and twenty-four (occasionally twenty-five) Sundays after Trinity. Such an arrangement would really simplify the Calendar, and would involve no sacrifice of religious principle. It was provisionally accepted by the British Parliament in 1928, but there seems no likelihood of its general adoption at present.

But besides the yearly commemoration of the great events in the Gospel story there are a number of days assigned to saints and martyrs in our Calendar as well.

Why is this? It is because Christ Himself is "glorified in His saints." It was customary in the primitive Church to commemorate the martyrs on the anniversary of their deaths. They were men like ourselves, and what they did by the power on Christ dwelling in them we can do also.

> "Worthy deeds they wrought and wonders,
> Worthy of the Name they bore;
> We with meetest praise and sweetest
> Honour them for evermore."

The "Feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the year" are commonly called "Red-letter days" because they are printed in red in the better editions of the Prayer Book. In the small books where red is not used they are printed in *italics* instead. The saints commemorated on these days are all New Testament saints, and proper Collects, Epistles and Gospels and Lessons are provided for each. But besides these there are a number of "Black-letter days," concerning the observance of which no directions are given, though individual bishops frequently authorize services for them. These are for the most part commemorations of saints well known in the history of the Church. It is difficult to explain the selection of the names in the Prayer Book of 1662, but it has been recognized in recent years that it is fitting that a fuller list of the Church's heroes should be kept, and the Calendar has been carefully revised for the Canadian Prayer Book, and for the new English, Scottish and American Books as well. The Irish Calendar omits all Black-letter days. Among the enrichments of the new English Book are several Collects, Epistles and Gospels for Black-letter Saints' days, besides "common"—that is, not restricted to particular days—collects, etc., for Martyrs, for Doctors and Confessors, for Bishops and for Black-letter Saints' days not otherwise provided for. So also in the Scottish Prayer Book.

It may be noted that the Transfiguration, which was a Black-letter day in the old Prayer Book (August 6th), was made a Red-letter day, first in the American Book of 1892, then in the Canadian, Irish and Scottish Books, and in the English Book of 1928. St. Patrick's day (March 17th) is given the status of a Red-letter day in the Irish Book of 1927. St. Mary Magdalene (July 22nd) is a Red-letter day in the new English Book, but not in the other revisions. The Scottish book adds certain local Saints, Kentigern (or Mungo), Columba, Ninian, and Margaret of Scotland, besides St. Patrick.

"*When ye Fast*"

To many people the "*Table of the Vigils, Fasts, and Days of Abstinence, to be observed in the Year,*" is altogether meaningless, or is regarded as a relic of mediæval superstition which ought to be abolished as not in keeping with the enlightenment of the twentieth century. But are we less in need of self-discipline now than the people of former ages? The reply is, perhaps, "Let us abstain from sin, and discipline our souls, as the first Morning Lesson for Ash Wednesday teaches." Yes, but what the prophet teaches there is that the bodily fast *alone* is not enough. We sing in one of our Lenten hymns,

> "But vain all outward sign of grief,
>   And vain the form of prayer,
> Unless the heart implore relief,
>   And penitence be there,"

and the opening words of the Epistle for Ash Wednesday, from the prophet Joel, show how the two go together: " Turn ye even to me, saith the Lord, with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning." Body and soul are intimately knit together, and if we would humble our souls before God in penitence for sin we cannot suffer the body, which is the instrument of our sins, to " fare sumptuously every day," and indulge in various sorts of pleasures. There is no distinct command given by our Blessed Lord to fast, but He clearly implies that it is a religious duty of like obligation with almsgiving and prayer, for He says, " When ye fast, be not as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance." It was making oneself conspicuous, " to be seen of men," that He disapproved of, not fasting in itself. No one would think of charging the first Methodists with Pharisaism; but this is what John Wesley says of their practice: " While we were at Oxford, the rule of every Methodist was (unless in case of sickness) to fast every Wednesday and Friday in the year in imitation of the practice of the primitive Church, for which they have the highest regard." In another place he says, " It is not an end, but is a precious means thereto; a means which God Himself has ordained, and in which, therefore, when it is duly used, He will surely give us His blessing."

We know that our Blessed Lord Himself and His Apostles fasted, and that fasting was a practice of the primitive Church, and, in the face of this knowledge, it would surely be presumptuous for any in this age of luxury and self-indulgence to pretend that they can do without it. " Health is seldom injured by abstinence," says a distinguished medical authority, " but constantly by over-indulgence."

There is no distinction intended in the Prayer Book between days of *fasting* and *abstinence*. We have here an instance of what Sir Henry Newbolt has pointed out, that, thanks to its two sources, Anglo-Saxon and Latin, our language is so rich in synonyms that the framers of the Prayer Book frequently used two words instead of making choice of one.

When we come to the times which the Church has appointed for her children to fast, there are first " *The Evens or Vigils* " before certain festivals. A Vigil was originally a night spent in watching and prayer before a festival; but this custom was given up and the previous day was kept as a fast. It was not until the seventeenth century that the Table of Vigils was introduced into the Prayer Book, and it is quite lawful to question the wisdom of its introduction. It has been omitted from the American Prayer Book and greatly reduced in the new English book. A proposal to omit it from the Canadian revision was rejected, and it remains. " It may be reasonable to suggest," says Dr. Frere, that " Vigils should be retained only in connection with the chief of the festivals," and this has been the course followed by the English Revisers, who confine them to the Eves of Christmas Day, Whitsunday, St. John Baptist, All Saints and St. Andrew.[1]

The fast of *Lent* as a preparation for Easter is of very early origin, but the rules governing it differed greatly in different places. The Church historian Socrates, writing in the early part of the fifth century, says that "those at Rome fast three successive weeks before Easter, excepting Saturdays and Sundays. Those in Illyrica and all over Greece and Alexandria observe a fast of six weeks, which they call the forty days fast." Speaking of the method of fasting, he says: "Some wholly abstain from things that have life; others feed on fish only of all living creatures; many, together with fish, eat fowl also. . . . Some abstain from eggs and all kinds of fruit: others partake of dry bread only; still others eat not even this; while others, having fasted till the ninth hour, afterwards take any sort of food without distinction."

---

[1] The Scottish Book reduces the Vigils to the days before Christmas Day, Easter Day, and Pentecost.

Since the seventh century the observance of a fast of forty days, exclusive of Sundays, seems to have generally prevailed. Lent in the early Church was the season for preparing candidates for baptism, and for special sermons of instruction. Public games were prohibited, and marriages were not solemnized during Lent.

Ember days are "The Fasts of the Four Seasons," called in Latin *Jejunia Quatuor temporum*, which the Germans shortened to Quatember, and hence our word Ember. They are peculiar to the Western Church, and date as far back as the middle of the fifth century, spreading from Rome, where they had been long observed. They seem to have been originally designed to supplicate God's blessing upon the several seasons of the year and to return thanks for benefits received. The Ember seasons are mentioned as times for ordination about the end of the same century; but it was not till the eighth century that the precise days were fixed—the Wednesday, Friday and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent, Whitsunday, Holy Cross Day (September 14th) and St. Lucy's Day (December 13th). There was an old couplet which ran:

> " Fasting days and Emberings be
> Lent, Whitsun, Holyrood, and Lucie."

The 31st Canon of 1604 directs " that no deacons or ministers be made and ordained, but only on the Sundays immediately following *Jejunia Quatuor temporum*, commonly called *Ember Weeks*."

The American and Canadian Prayer Books provide special lessons for Ember days,[1] and a proper Epistle and Gospel are given in both the Canadian Book and the American Revision of 1929; the English 1928 Book gives a choice of Epistles and Gospels.

Rogation days are the three days preceding Ascension Day. A rogation meant in former days a litany sung or said in procession. This form of service was introduced by Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne, in Southern France, about A.D. 470 during a time of great distress from earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, and it soon became general in France and spread to England. Supplications were made that the land might be defended from war and pestilence, and that the fields might yield their fruits. With this was connected the custom of perambulating the parish, or " beating the bounds." A homily was provided in Queen Elizabeth's time to be read, and the Injunctions of 1559 directed Psalms ciii. and civ. to be said. All the Revisions have special prayers for Rogation days, asking

---

[1] The American for the September and December Ember days, and the Scottish for September only.

God's blessing upon the land; also special lessons. And all except the Irish provide proper Psalms, and Collect, Epistle and Gospel.

As early as the second century there is mention of the weekly observance of Wednesdays and Fridays as fasts or " Stations," the latter being a military term which signified standing on guard against spiritual enemies. These are still recognized in the Eastern Church. They were said to be " half-fasts," as the fast only extended till three o'clock. It is doubtful if they were ever universally kept, and in the West the observance of Wednesday died out, except (in England) as one of the days on which the Litany was to be said. We have no regulations as to how the fast of Friday is to be observed, though it is an unwritten tradition that fish should be substituted for flesh on that day. George Herbert, in his *The Country Parson*, says: " Friday is his day of humiliation, which he celebrates not only with abstinence of diet, but also of company, recreation and all outward contentments, and besides, with confession of sins and all acts of mortification," and he adds that " to eat little, and that unpleasant, is the natural rule of fasting, although it be flesh." " Catholics fasted only till the ninth hour, when our Lord died upon the Cross," says Dr. Kidd in his *History of the Church*, " *i.e.* they refrained from *prandium*, *dejeuner*, or breakfast, but took *cena*, or dinner. Montanists, on the contrary, kept up the fast till nightfall, the hour of the Lord's burial. They took neither *prandium* nor *cena;* but late in the evening a supper of water only, dry bread and the driest fruits and vegetables. All this they made into an iron rule. The Church, on the other hand, refused to exalt ascetic practices into first principles, and stood out for freedom."

The Ornaments

On the page before the beginning of Morning Prayer there are some general directions concerning the service. The first paragraph speaks of the place where the service should be said—" the accustomed place of the Church, Chapel or Chancel." This first appears in the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth. Exactly what it means it is impossible to say positively, but most probably it means the Quire, where the prayers were said, during the three years and a half that the first Prayer Book was in use. But it appears that the Reading Desk made its first appearance in Elizabethan days. Shepherd (1805) says in his *Elucidations of Morning and Evening Prayer* that " for the accommodation both of the minister and the congregation, some of the bishops . . . dispensed with the performance of the Morning and Evening Service at the altar, and in many places *reading pews* were erected in the body of the Church, in which the minister read Morning and Evening Prayer. . . . Many of the reading pews had two desks, one for the Book of Common Prayer, and one opposite to it for the Bible. When the minister read the prayers he necessarily looked towards the altar, but when the Bible was read, by turning towards the people he would be best heard."

The words " the Chancels shall remain," etc., probably mean that they should not be destroyed. A writer in *The Prayer Book Dictionary*, speaking of a party headed by Bucer and Hooper who wished to abolish chancels, says : " Greedy nobles and squires, on the look-out for cheap building materials, backed up the plea, that they might get the lead from the roof and stone from the walls. Cranmer and the Revisers of 1552 resisted the pressure." So the chancels were allowed to remain as they had done in times past, and if in many churches during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries they were hidden from view by the huge pulpits of those days, we have returned again to better things.

The second paragraph treats of the *Ornaments*. The term "ornaments" as here used, according to the report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline (1906), "includes only such articles and things as are used in the services and ministrations; it is not confined to articles of decoration or embellishment, but it does not include articles not used in the services." Thus a stained-glass window or a frontal would not in this sense be an ornament, but a pulpit would; lights, stationary or suspended, would not be ornaments, but lights carried in procession would. Two classes of ornaments are mentioned—" of the Church and of the Ministers thereof."

The " ornaments of the Church " by the authority of Parliament in 1548, if we except the white vesture or " Chrisome " for the newly baptized, which was omitted in 1552, could only be the articles now in ordinary use —the Bible, the Prayer Book, Vessels for Holy Communion, Font, Pulpit, the Lord's Table or Altar, Bishop's Chair and a few minor things. These and other things not legally authorized then, as Organs, Prayer Desks, Lecterns, Faldstools and Kneeling Cushions, are everywhere recognised now.

But how about the ornaments of the ministers? The

Act authorizing the Prayer Book of 1549 was passed by Parliament just before the end of the second year of Edward, and in that book it is ordered that " in saying of Mattins and Evensong, baptizing and burying, the Minister in parish churches and chapels annexed to the same shall use a Surplice," and that it is " seemly that Graduates, when they do preach, shall use such hoods as pertaineth to their several degrees," while for the Holy Communion the priest is to wear " a white Albe plain, with a vestment or cope," and the assistant clergy are to have " Albes with tunicles." " Legally," says Bishop Gibson in his *Codex* (1713), " the ornaments of ministers performing Divine Service are the same now as they were in 2 Edward VI."

We know what these ornaments are. The *Surplice* commonly worn now is the same as in the sixteenth century—gathered at the neck, reaching to within 10 or 12 inches of the ground, and having long pointed sleeves. It has suffered various modifications, as, *e.g.*, when it was made open in the front in the seventeenth century, because otherwise it could not be put on over the full-bottomed wigs; and in modern days when some have followed a fashion of eliminating all fullness, or of cutting it so short that it scarcely comes below the hips, and edging it with lace in imitation of the undignified Roman cotta.

The *Hood* too was affected by the wig. Formerly it came over the shoulders as a short cape; but to avoid the wig it was let down at the back, with only a band at the neck to hold it, and so it generally remains.

The *Alb* is a linen garment something like a surplice, but is longer, reaching to the heels. It has close-fitting sleeves, and is girded about the waist with a cord. *Apparels*, which were pieces of embroidery on silk, or other material, were sometimes attached to the cuffs of the sleeves of the Alb, and to the front and back of the skirt, and also to the *Amice*, which is a square of linen serving as a collar, worn about the neck and shoulders, under the Alb.

The *Vestment* (or Chasuble) is a large oval garment of silk or other material with an opening in the middle that it may be put over the head.

The *Cope* is a large semicircular cape without sleeves, fastened at the neck with a clasp (known as the morse) or band. The late Dr. J. Wickham Legg, who was a high authority on such matters, suggested that " in the early times the cope may have been a chasuble slit up in front for greater convenience."

The *Tunicle*, as the name implies, is a short tunic of silk or other material, reaching a little below the knees, with rather wide sleeves, and open at the sides from the waist down, and sometimes ornamented with embroidery.

But having found out what the vestures are to which the rubric refers we have not settled the matter. It is a curious fact that the directions there given were not followed either in the days of Queen Elizabeth or after the Restoration. A Committee of five bishops submitted a report on the Ornaments to the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury in 1908, in which they say " that from the first the rubric was never fully obeyed, and that no attempt was made to enforce its requirements as a whole." Archbishop Parker had great difficulty even in securing the wearing of the surplice, and did not attempt to enforce the use of any other vesture, contenting himself with a minimum of decency and order, instead of a compliance with the full requirements of the law.

What then are we to make of it all? Simply that the Church of England in 1559 and again in 1662 looked back upon the well-ordered services prescribed by the Prayer Book of 1549 as an ideal at which to aim, but that ideal was never realized. But how far is the rubric binding upon us to-day? Well, however desirable we may deem it to live up to the Church's ideal, there is certainly not the same obligation to reintroduce that which has fallen into abeyance as there would be to retain it if it were in use. It is a recognized principle of Canon Law that, when things ordered have fallen into disuse, no one is obliged to use them unless directed to do so by proper ecclesiastical authority. While then (to use a phrase or two from the Report mentioned above) "their use is a reverent and seemly order," the questions regarding them are "questions of expediency rather than of principle."

It may be well to add here a note concerning the Preacher's Gown, which was used almost everywhere in the eighteenth century, and first half of the nineteenth. It is sometimes incorrectly spoken of as the Geneva Gown, but the Puritans, as a matter of fact, disliked it as much as they did any other vestment. It was simply the priest's gown of former days which was worn by the clergy over their cassocks as they went to and from church, and it was never prescribed to be used in the church at service time. There is no impropriety in its use in the pulpit, and it is so worn by University preachers in England; but they take no part in the service.

The ceremony of the minister in his surplice, preceded by the verger, going down from the chancel to a vestry near the door and presently coming back wearing gown and bands was very popular two generations ago, but there was neither rubric nor canon to justify it.

The Ornaments Rubric is omitted in the Revised Books outside England, except the Canadian. But in the Scottish Church the use of the 1662 Book is legal, so that what is allowed by the rubric is allowed in Scotland. The Canons of the Irish Church forbid any vesture other than the surplice. The English 1928 Book prescribes that "the Priest, in celebrating the Holy Communion, shall wear either a surplice with stole or with scarf and hood, or a white alb plain with a vestment or cope."

For a right understanding of the use of ecclesiastical vestures, and as a safeguard against anything like a superstitious reverence for these things on the one hand, or a superstitious dread of them on the other, it may be well briefly to consider their history and significance.

First, let it be clearly understood that they rest, not upon Scriptural but upon ecclesiastical authority, and any regulations concerning their use or disuse or alteration would come under the general proposition of Article XX, that "the Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies." Thus they are on a different plane from the Sacraments. They are not of primary but of secondary importance. An illustration will help to make this clear. Suppose a priest is on a missionary tour. He takes pains, of course, that in his ministrations all things shall be done decently and in order; but (as sometimes happens) his luggage goes astray. If no surplice is available, the exigencies of the case quite justify his holding a public service without one, and even celebrating the Holy Communion without the proper vessels; but he would not be justified in any circumstances in substituting anything else for wine, for that is one of the essentials of the Sacrament.

But while there is no rule in Holy Scripture that the clergy should wear a distinctive dress in ministering in the church, it may fairly be maintained that the provision of garments for Aaron and his sons " for glory and for beauty " points to a principle which may fitly be recognized in Christian worship.

It is unquestionable that, as the Five Bishops to whom reference has been made state, " at first the Christian clergy used no distinctive dress, and as long as the garb of daily life continued unaltered in the higher ranks of society, a celebrating or officiating bishop, priest or deacon differed, if at all, only in some slight variations of vesture from a well-dressed layman." Pope Celestine, writing in 428, condemns the use by the clergy of a dress different from that of the laity round about them, but he was probably alluding to their dress out of doors. Early in the fifth century, however, Fulgentius, a saintly bishop of North Africa, declined (like Hooper in the reign of Edward VI) to wear the official scarf that other bishops wore, retaining his monk's dress and wearing " no different costume in the celebration of the mysteries." Strange to say, it was in their civil rather than in their ecclesiastical dress that the clergy first differed from the laity. The principal garments worn by men throughout the Empire in the first four centuries of our era were two, an under-garment or tunic, and a sleeveless upper-garment put on as a protection against rain or cold. The former was white or of some light colour; in the East of linen, but in the West sometimes of wool. The cloak, which was called by various names, sometimes *planeta*, and later *casula* (whence the word chasuble), was of heavier material and generally of darker colour. From these two types of garment the sacred vestments both of the Eastern and Western Churches are derived. This costume was in use in the fifth century by laymen of distinction. The coming in of the barbarian tribes changed the dress of the people generally, and the more dignified costume of the Romans was laid aside for the short tunic, trousers and cloak of the invaders. The clergy, however, were forbidden to wear secular dress and retained the ancient costume. "As time proceeded it was felt to be right to check the discretion or caprice of individuals, and to prescribe by canonical rule what had been allowed by custom and religious association." Thus gradually there came about a distinction between the outdoor dress of the clergy and their dress in church, more regard being had for the beauty and dignity of the latter. In Gaul, about A.D. 500, St. Remigius left to his successor a white vestment or cloak for use on Sundays and high festivals, which was presumably a garment to be used in his sacred ministrations.

There were badges of honour by which clergy of different grades might be distinguished; but that is on the same principle as, in the courts, we recognize a King's Counsel by his gown, and the different officers of the army and navy by their peculiar ornaments. The alb, the surplice and the rochet (the linen garment worn by a bishop under his chimere) are worn by laymen sometimes, but the propriety of their use by women is open to question. If the Temple processions included "damsels playing with the timbrels," there is no doubt that they dressed as damsels and were not arrayed in the habiliments of men. The cope too, in a simple form, used sometimes to be worn by laymen in the choir when churches were not heated, and by ministers at funerals in cold weather, over their surplices, which was a very sensible custom. The "decent cope" ordered in the 34th Canon to be used by bishops and others in cathedrals means one that is seemly and decorous. Rich and beautiful copes both ancient and modern are worn on special occasions at St. Paul's, Westminster Abbey and elsewhere. These are what the Canon prescribes. The "Decency in Apparel enjoined to Ministers" in the 74th Canon refers to outdoor dress. The "accustomed apparel" of bishops when the Canon was drawn up (1604) was cassock, rochet and chimere, the latter a sleeveless gown of black silk (or scarlet cloth) with slits in the sides for the arms, and that of other "persons ecclesiastical" was cassock (double-breasted, with no buttons in front), gown, tippet (or scarf) and square cap. The latter was a soft cap, but has since developed into the stiff "mortar-board" worn in colleges. The Italian "biretta" was unknown and has no recognition in the English Church.

It should be said in behalf of the surplice, that although it is a mediæval garment, and is not found before the eleventh century, it holds a very honourable position in the English Church, and the Constitutions of Walter Reynolds, Archbishop of Canterbury (1322), order that "no clerk be permitted to minister in the Office of the Altar unless clothed in a surplice," and when, in another connection, Archbishop Peckham (1279) directs a minister to be "clothed in a surplice, wearing an *orarium*," Lyndwood (1433) explains the latter as a stole, which, he says, the priest should use in all sacred services.

In conclusion, a few words may be added concerning the liturgical use of colours. It began in a very simple way. The richest and best would be used on high days; and simpler things for ordinary occasions. There was nothing like a definite sequence of colours until the twelfth century, and then it was only in the West, and differed greatly in different parts, and the uses of cathedrals were not followed in poorer and smaller churches. It was under Pope Innocent III (1198–1216) that the precise rule was issued for the sequence of four colours, white, red, green and violet, with black for funerals or requiems, which now so widely obtains. It never was adopted in England in pre-Reformation days. "The symbolism involved," in the opinion of the Five Bishops, "is arbitrary and fanciful except on the very broad principles which first prevailed, that white is a symbol of joy, purity and newness of life, and black and purple of sorrow and penitence, while red is almost universally accepted as proper to festivals of martyrs."

CHAPTER IV

OF MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER (i)

Position and Character of these Services

THE criticism is sometimes heard that the arrangement of services in the Prayer Book is at fault because the Holy Communion, as the chief and highest service, is not accorded the first place; but the explanation of this is simple. According to the Prayer Book theory, Morning Prayer is to be said before Holy Communion. Notice in evidence of this, *e.g.*, that the Second Lesson at Mattins on Palm Sunday is St. Matthew, chap. xxvi, and the Gospel is chap. xxvii. The Litany too, on days when it is said, comes after Mattins. But, as Morning and Evening Prayer together make up the Daily Office or Divine Service as it used to be called, the first two are not separated, but printed together and given the first place in the book.[1]

We have seen in a former chapter that the Daily Office is a compilation and abbreviation of the Hours Services, but it is to be noted that these mediæval services, beautiful as they were, are not popular services, and, except in convents and in the private devotions of priests, are past and gone. The people have no part in them. That daily round of Psalmody and Scripture and Canticles and Prayers which they were intended to provide survives only in the form in which it is cast in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. It is indeed a goodly heritage, and it is for us to learn to appreciate its value and not to disparage it.

---

[1] The arrangement of the new American Book is considerably changed. Immediately after Morning and Evening Prayer come Prayers and Thanksgivings, then the Litany; then the Office for Ash Wednesday; and then the Holy Communion, followed by the Collects, Epistles and Gospels. After these come the Occasional Offices, then the Psalter, and after that the Ordinal. The Irish Book places the Psalms immediately before the Holy Communion.

While it is true that we have lost some desirable features of the old services, we have retained the most important ones, and in some ways have made some undoubted improvements, particularly in our well-ordered course of Lessons.

The services of Morning and Evening Prayer—*Mattins* and *Evensong*, as they were called in the first Prayer Book and in the Act of Uniformity of Queen Elizabeth—are the same in structure, and the introductory portion in the Prayer Book of 1662 is identical. The English book of 1928 provides a common Introduction to Morning and Evening Prayer. Then follow the same features of Praise, Instruction and Prayer: the Psalms, with their *Glorias*, the Lessons, each followed by a Canticle, the Creed to signify our acceptance and Christian interpretation of all which we have heard, and then the highest of all prayers, the Lord's Prayer, after which follow the Collects and intercessions.

Note too the way in which the service is varied throughout by interchange between priest and people, so as to preserve due attention. The Confession, Lord's Prayer and Creed are said by all; the Psalms and Canticles are sung (where ancient precedent is followed) antiphonally, that is one side of the choir answering the other, or, if they are not sung, are read by minister and congregation taking alternate verses; the Lessons are read by a single voice; the Versicles have each its response; the Collects and Prayers are said by the minister, and the people answer *Amen*. It is not a one-man service in which the congregation are merely listeners, but the people are made to feel that the service is their own.

It is substantially the service of the Synagogue, such as Our Lord Himself and His Apostles were accustomed to attend; only it is enriched by bringing in the New Testament and the Christian faith. Its basis is the recitation of the Psalms and the reading of the Bible.

As it was first drawn up by Cranmer and his colleagues it began with the Lord's Prayer, and ended with the third Collect. The Sentences, Exhortation, Confession and Absolution were prefixed in the second Prayer Book, and the prayers and intercessions after the Collects have been added from time to time. In the manuscript Prayer Book subscribed by Convocation in 1661 (of which a facsimile copy was published in 1891) a double line is drawn after the Absolution both in Morning and Evening Prayer, marking a distinction between the Introduction and the service proper. These lines seem to have been omitted in all printed copies. In strict propriety they should have come after the Lord's Prayer, for that too is a part of the preparation, and in the first Prayer Book was directed to be said by the priest alone, the service being supposed to begin with the appropriate words, "O Lord, open Thou my lips." The priest was directed to say aloud what in the older form he said privately.

Freeman says: "It may be considered somewhat doubtful whether we ought to reckon it in the introductory portion, or as the commencement of the service itself; which certainly was anciently held to begin with 'O Lord, open,' etc. In the Eastern ordinary offices it was also part of the introduction. It is perhaps best, therefore, so to consider it still."[1]

The Introduction

The Introduction is properly a preparation of minister and people for taking part in the service which follows. Canon Newbolt compares it to the laver which stood at the entrance to the Holy Place of the Tabernacle, in which the priests cleansed themselves before they began their sacred ministrations. Notice in the Exhortation how this idea is brought out: "Although we ought at all times humbly to acknowledge our sins before God; yet ought we most chiefly so to do, when we assemble and meet together," etc., and in the Absolution, "That those things may please him which we do at this present," which indicates the service we are about to offer.

See how beautifully the Lord's Prayer fits in here with this idea. As children of God we meet together to do Him service, and, mindful of the perfect worship of the heavenly host, we pray that the honour of God's Name may be uppermost in our mind in the homage we are about to offer, that we may show forth His

---

[1] The English Revision prints the Introduction up to and including the Absolution separately; the actual Office begins with "O Lord, open . . .", the Lord's Prayer being omitted. The Scottish Book also omits the Lord's Prayer, but confines the Introduction to the opening sentences and the Exhortation.

Kingdom and do what is well-pleasing in His sight, as the holy angels do in heaven; and to this end we pray God to give us the sustenance of His grace without which we can do nothing good, that the sins which we have confessed may be forgiven, that we may not be led into the temptations which so naturally beset us of pride and forgetfulness of God, but may be delivered from the evils of irreverence, unbelief and such other things as might mar our service. Using the first Lord's Prayer in this sense, you will see that the central Lord's Prayer, which comes after the Creed, is in no sense a vain repetition.

If we look at the old selection of Sentences in the Prayer Book we shall see they are not concerned with the service as a whole, but only with the preliminary confession of sins. It has been well said that the Exhortation is a short sermon on this subject with a choice of eleven texts. And it accords well with any of these texts. In some of our modern revisions of the Prayer Book, however, this principle is entirely lost sight of. While it is well to mark the varying seasons of the Christian year, it is questionable whether it should be done by altering the character of the opening sentences. "Behold, I bring you good tidings," etc., "Awake, awake, put on strength," "The Lord is risen indeed," are hardly appropriate texts for a homily on confession. It is true that the Canadian book has what the American and Scottish books have not, a direction that one of the preceding (general) sentences is to be read after the special one, but this direction is largely ignored.

In all recent revisions provision is made (subject, however, to definite limitations) for shortening or omitting the Exhortation. The late Bishop Creighton of London wrote to a correspondent who asked whether this might be done: " The Exhortations are not part of the structure of the service itself. They are instructions to the people; they are homilies or addresses, valuable as models of teaching, set forth for that purpose at a time when teaching was rarer than it is now. Their contents are now expressed in sermons. Their omission does not take from the meaning of the service." The English revision prescribes it for use on Advent Sunday and the first Sunday in Lent. It is certainly desirable that the people should hear it frequently, if only to be reminded why they are expected to come to church. And note that here the Exhortation confirms what has been said about the Introduction not being a part of the service proper, but only a preparation for it; for in enumerating the purposes for which we assemble and meet together nothing is said about confessing our sins. The four purposes specified are (1) " to render thanks for the great benefits that we have received at his hands, (2) to set forth his most worthy praise, (3) to hear his most holy Word, and (4) to ask those things which are requisite and necessary, as well for the body as the soul." This is sound and scriptural, putting the glory of God first, and the things which pertain to our own edification and relief afterwards. Public worship is not primarily to *get* something, but to *give* something.

The " *General* " Confession is so called because it is expressed in general terms, and does not specify particular sins. We can all truly join in saying " we have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and we have done those things which we ought not to have done;" but the sins of omission and commission of which we are guilty are different for each, and God, who knoweth the secrets of the heart, knows what is in the minds of each.

The Absolution which follows is, as Bishop Barry says, " God's answer to the Confession, pronounced by the priest alone, standing in the attitude of authority over the kneeling people." The authority by which he speaks is that committed to him at his ordination. If a corporation authorizes its treasurer to sign cheques, he exercises this peculiar authority because it has been committed to him and not to others. A better comparison perhaps is that of the magistrate ministering justice and having authority to acquit or condemn. This authority does not come from the people, but, through proper channels, from the King, or head of the State, in whose name the magistrate acts. The power to forgive sins belongs to Christ; but they who, through proper channels, have received a commission to speak in His Name, have authority, where the necessary conditions of repentance and faith are fulfilled, to declare and pronounce Christ's forgiveness. "Since the priest" says Wheatly (1742), " has the ministry of reconciliation committed to him by God . . . those in the congregation who truly repent and unfeignedly believe God's holy Gospel (though the priest does not know who or how many they are that do so) have yet their pardon conveyed and sealed to them at that very instant through his ministration; it being the ordinary method of God with His Church to communicate His blessings through the ministry of the priest." A deacon or a layman may not say this form of absolution simply because he has not been given " power and commandment " to do so. To make this clear the general term "Minister," which was in the rubric before, was changed to the more definite term " Priest " in the revision of 1662.

There are two other absolutions in the Prayer Book —in the Holy Communion Office and in the Visitation of the Sick—which differ from this and from each other in form but are essentially the same. Bishop Sparrow says of them : " It is all one as to the remission of sins in the penitent, whether the priest absolves him after this form, ' Almighty God, who hath given me and all priests power to pronounce pardon to the penitent, *He pardoneth you,*' or this, ' By virtue of a commission granted to me from God *I absolve you ;*' or lastly, ' *God pardon you,* namely, by me His servant, according to the promise, *Whose sins ye remit they are remitted.*' All these are but several expressions of the same things."

"*O come, let us Worship*"

The two versicles and their responses with which the service proper begins are taken from Psalms li and lxx, and they have been used in a similar connection from the sixth century at least. They come in very fitly between the confession of our unworthiness to offer praise and the praise itself. Then follows the ascription of glory to the Blessed Trinity (" Glory be," etc.), commonly called the *Gloria Patri,* to distinguish it from the *Gloria in excelsis* in the Communion Service. After this comes the versicle, " Praise ye the

Lord," with its response. In 1549 there was no response here but "Alleluia," which was directed to be said or sung from Easter to Trinity Sunday. The old tradition was that "Alleluia" should not be said from Septuagesima to Easter, and for this reason on the last Sunday after Epiphany, before Septuagesima, we sing:

> "Alleluia cannot always
> Be our song while here below;
> Alleluia our transgressions
> Make us for a while forego."

The service of praise thus begun properly continues with the *Venite*, which from very early times was sung before the Psalms of the day. In this we remind ourselves of the worship due to God, namely, (1) to render thanks to Him as our Maker and Preserver, (2) to kneel before Him in prayer, and (3) to hearken and obey His word. Bishop Wordsworth calls this "the great invitatory Psalm of the ancient Western liturgies," and Freeman points out how well it is fitted to be "a prelude to the whole psalmody and worship of the day, whatever its character; since it touches with so perfect a felicity the highest and lowest notes of the scale, that there is nothing so jubilant or so penitential as not to lie within the compass of it." [1]

In the old services there used to be sung with the *Venite* an "Invitatory," or invitation to praise God, which varied with the season. The method of singing this differed. The simplest way was to sing it before the *Venite* and again after the *Gloria;* a more elaborate method was to sing it complete, before the Psalm, and after the second, sixth, and tenth verses, the latter half only after the fourth and seventh verses, and complete after the *Gloria.* This method was obviously unsuited for congregational singing, and Freeman interprets the rubric in the first Prayer Book which directs the *Venite* to be sung " without any Invitatory," as meaning without any of the type that had been customary. The idea of the Invitatory was a good one. It gave the keynote to the *Venite* and was most useful in marking the particular festivals. The English 1928 Book restores the permissive use of Invitatories, but with the restriction that the simpler method of singing them is to be followed. Here are a few of them:—For Advent Sunday, " Our Lord and Saviour draweth nigh: O come, let us adore him;" For Epiphany, " The Lord hath manifested forth his glory: O come, let us adore him;" for Trinity Sunday, " One God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity: O come, let us adore him." The last American and Scottish revisions also provide the Invitatories but omits any directions how they are to be sung. This is a real enrichment, and will doubtless be sanctioned by many bishops where the Prayer Book does not prescribe it.

---

[1] The Revisions treat the *Venite* in different ways: *English*—to be used, without last four verses, on Sundays and holy-days. *Scottish*—last four verses may be omitted. *Canadian*—omitted on Great Festivals and Good Friday. *American*—printed in a short form, with the addition of verses from other Psalms; omitted on occasions. *Irish and Scottish*—may be omitted on Ash Wednesday and Good Friday.

The Christian Use of the Psalter

The use of the Psalms in the public worship of the Church was taken over from the worship of the Temple and the Synagogue. " Whenever the Book of Psalms began to be put together, and whenever it was completed," writes Dean Church, "from that time to this there has never been a momentary pause when somewhere or other the praise of His glory and the prayers of His worship have not been rehearsed in its words." Both in form and character the Psalms are peculiarly fitted for such use, for, as Dr. Driver says, "the soul is displayed in them in converse with God, disclosing to Him its manifold emotions, its hopes and fears, its desires and aspirations." He adds: "It is the surprising variety of mood and subject and occasion in the Psalms, combined with their deep spirituality, their fullness of human feeling, their ready applicability to the needs and situation of practically all men in all ages, and a literary form which all can appreciate which gives them their catholicity and adapts them to form the hymn-book, not only of the second Temple, but of the Christian Church." "What is there," says the judicious Hooker, "necessary for mankind to know which the Psalms are not able to teach? Heroic magnanimity, exquisite justice, grave moderation, exact wisdom, repentance unfeigned, unwearied patience, the mysteries of God, the suffering of Christ, the terrors of wrath, the comforts of grace, the works of Providence over this world, and the promised joys of the world to come, all good necessary to be known or done or had, this one celestial fountain yieldeth. . . . Hereof it is we covet to make the Psalms especially familiar unto all. This is the very cause why we iterate the Psalms oftener than any other part of the Scripture besides; the cause whereof we inure the people together with the minister, and not the minister alone, to read them as other parts of Scripture he doth." St. Chrysostom tells us that in his days (407) many who could not read knew the Psalms by heart.

But there is one difficulty which meets us. How are we to regard what are called the Imprecatory Psalms, in which the Psalmist prays for vengeance upon his enemies? It must be clearly recognized that these are not written in the spirit of the Gospel, but they use the language of the age which taught men to love their own people and to hate their enemies, and by this standard they must be judged. Yet, as Dr. Kirkpatrick points out, " they are not dictated merely by private vindictiveness and a personal thirst for revenge. They spring ultimately from a zeal for God's cause, and they express a willingness, to leave vengeance in the hands of Him to whom it belongs. They set an example of moral earnestness, of righteous indignation and of burning zeal for the cause of God. It is impossible that such language should be repeated in its old and literal sense by any follower of Him who has bidden us to love our enemies and to pray for them that persecute us."

Still, the suitability of using these in public worship is questioned, and the English 1928 Book places in brackets for permissive omission Ps. lviii; verses 21 to 23 of Ps. lxix; 5 to 19 of Ps. cix; and 7 to 9 of Ps. cxxxvii.

The liturgical arrangement of the Psalms has varied from time to time. The recital of the whole Psalter in course began in the monasteries in the fourth century, and theoretically was the basis of the Breviary system, but what with fixed Psalms for the several services and special Psalms for holy days, the course was so broken that, as the Preface states, " a few of them have been daily said and the rest utterly omitted." With the

Psalms were "Antiphons," or refrains based on the general idea of the particular Psalms and sung after each verse, or group of verses; but these were found burdensome and in some cases confusing, and so were dropped. In the Prayer Book the old idea of reciting the Psalter in course was retained, but a monthly recitation instead of a weekly one was provided. The English, Scotch, Irish and American Revisions have Tables of special Psalms for optional use on Sundays and the chief holy-days; the Canadian Book contents itself with providing Selections of Psalms which may be used instead of the Psalms for the day.

A brief notice will suffice for the Prayer Book version of the Psalms. It is, with a few minor alterations, the Psalter of the Great Bible of 1539, which was Coverdale's version. At the revision of the Prayer Book of 1662 it was directed that the Lessons of Scripture be taken from the Authorized Version of 1611, but an exception was made in the case of the Psalms, as it was thought the old version was "smoother and easier to sing."

A very conservative revision of this Psalter was prepared in England by a Committee, including distinguished literary men, at the request of the Primate (Dr. Davidson). It retained the rhythm of the old, and only corrected mistakes in translation and a few obsolete words. This is largely used in the 1927 Irish and 1929 American Books, but unfortunately circumstances prevented its adoption in the English Book of 1928.

The Lessons

It has been claimed, and the claim would hardly be disputed, that the Anglican Church provides with greater care than any other religious body for the complete and orderly reading of Holy Scriptures in Divine Service. This is indeed an honourable distinction, and since the adoption of the new English Table of Lessons (1922), which has had a great influence on other Revisions, there is even fuller justification for the claim.

The practice of reading two Lessons in the public services of the Church follows the example of the Synagogue, and Cassian (*c.* 445) says that he found the custom of reading one Lesson from the Old Testament and another from the New prevailing throughout Egypt, and that it was so ancient that it had not been taught by men, but by the ministry of angels. In the Breviary services, other than Mattins, of the Middle Ages the Lessons were so reduced that they consisted of only a verse or two; but in the monasteries there was the reading of books of the Bible, not according to any fixed rule, but at the discretion of the abbot, the reader stopping when he was told, and the lesson each day beginning where that of the previous day left off.

The reformed Breviary of Cardinal Quignon (1535) provided three Lessons, the first from the Old Testament, the second from the New, and the third from the lives of the saints (on Saints' days) or from the Epistles. Cranmer borrowed largely from this Breviary in drawing up the first Prayer Book, and the scheme of Lessons was on Quignon's lines; but he left out the third Lesson, and the more ancient custom of the two Lessons from the Old and New Testaments respectively prevailed in all branches of the Anglican Church until the passing of what is commonly called "The

Shortened Service Act" in 1872, which (under certain restrictions) permits the omission of one of the Lessons.

An unfortunate result of this permission has sometimes been the neglect of the reading of the Old Testament, which has a tendency to discredit those Scriptures which were so highly esteemed in Apostolic days and were able to make their readers "wise unto salvation." There seems to be an idea in the minds of some that with the New Testament in our hands we have no need of the Old. It may be useful to quote here some weighty words of Dr. Kirkpatrick, Dean of Ely: "Our Lord declared that He came not to supersede but to fulfil the Law and the Prophets; it is indisputable that His own spiritual life and that of the Apostles was nourished by the Old Testament; and there is no hint in their teaching that the time would ever come when the Old Testament would cease to be a treasury of instruction for the Christian Church. Rather it is everywhere implied that in the light of the new revelation the old words must gain new force, and become instinct with fresh life and power. The old messages are seen to be an essential part of one continuous, progressive revelation. The New Testament presumes them as its preparation and basis, and illuminates them by its fuller light." Again he writes: "We need, it has been well said, to put ourselves to school with every part of the Old Testament as of the New, if we would understand the fullness of Divine Truth and grasp it firmly."

The rubrical direction, "*He that readeth so standing and turning himself, as he may best be heard of all such as are present,*" indicates that the Lessons are primarily for edification of the people. The Irish Book specifies that the Lessons are to be read "by the Minister, or other fit person appointed by him." Mention has already been made of the reading-pew introduced in Queen Elizabeth's time which had one desk for the Prayer Book, looking towards the east or upper end of the chancel, and one opposite to it looking towards the people, for the Bible. The reading of the Lessons from a lectern, which is so common at the present day, is not mentioned by early writers on the Prayer Book, and cannot be justified by the Ornaments Rubric. Generally speaking it began in cathedrals in the seventeenth century, and its adoption in parish churches is characterized by Mr. W. C. Bishop as "one of the mistakes of the nineteenth century." It has been truly said that the rubric justifies the reader's "going to the chancel entrance, or into the nave of the church, and reading there with or without the use of a lectern."

It is customary to read the Lessons from the Authorized Version. Indeed the fact that its text is printed for the Epistles and Gospels stamps it as the official Church version. But no objection is as a rule raised by authority if the Revised Version is used. A special Revision has been prepared for use in the American Church.

The Lectionary of 1549 read the larger part of the Old Testament and Apocrypha consecutively according to the civil year, a chapter at a time. At Mattins the Gospels and the Acts were read three times in a year; at Evensong the Epistles similarly. The Revelation was omitted from the scheme, and the lection was always a complete chapter. Some changes were introduced later, but the scheme was substantially the same until

1871. The New (now called the Old) Lectionary was then introduced in England, whereby a double system came into use, according to the civil year for week-days, but according to the Church year for Sundays and holy-days. In 1922 a Revised Lectionary, arranged entirely according to the ecclesiastical year, was legalised in England for alternative use. This will be found substantially in the Irish and Canadian Books. The Scottish and American Lectionaries are independent, though the former has many features in common with the English.

Canticles

The custom of singing Psalms or Canticles after the Lessons comes from very early times and was expressly enjoined by the Council of Laodicea (about 360). Their purpose, Wheatly says, was " that so by variety the people might be secured against weariness and distraction." Strictly speaking, the term " Canticle " is restricted to sacred songs, other than Psalms, taken from the Bible. Besides those which we now have in our Prayer Book, the Church, both in the East and West, has used in her services the Prayer of Isaiah (chap. xii), the Songs of Moses (Exod. xv and Deut. xxxii), the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii), the Prayer of Habakkuk (chap. iii) and of Jonah (chap. ii), and several other passages. The word " Canticle " only occurs once in the Prayer Book, in the rubric before the *Benedicite.* The *Te Deum* and *Benedictus* are referred to as *Hymns.* Certain Psalms (c, xcviii, and lxvii) were inserted in the revision of 1552 which might be used instead of the Canticles that they follow.

The *Te Deum* is the Church's great hymn of thanksgiving for the knowledge of God revealed to us in Holy Scripture, and has been in use for more than 1400 years. Its origin was unknown for many centuries, and tradition ascribed it to St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, as being recited by them in alternate verses at the baptism of the latter. Some modern scholars confidently assign it to Nicetas (*c.* 402) a Serbian bishop of Remesiana, in Dacia. It is now generally printed in three sections.[1] The last section (of eight verses) is thought to be no part of the original hymn, but consists of versicles and responds appended to it. In the first and second parts we have two distinct hymns, the former setting forth the praise of the Blessed Trinity, and the latter an act of worship to Christ, based upon the work of redemption which He has wrought for man. Beautiful as this hymn is in the English of the Prayer Book, it has lost something in its translation from the Latin. Thus "the *noble* army of martyrs" should be "the *white-robed* army"; "numbered with thy saints" should be "rewarded." "This grand Canticle," says Bishop Barry, "by its whole tenor shows itself peculiarly appropriate as a link between the Lessons of the Old Testament and the New; but it has naturally been used at all times as the great festal expression of Christian Thanksgiving and Praise."

The *Benedicite* is given simply as an alternative Canticle with no direction as to its use. In the first Prayer Book there was a rubrical direction that the *Te Deum* was to be used daily throughout the year except in

---

[1] The English 1928 Book divides it into four sections in Mattins, three in the Accession Service.

Lent, when *Benedicite* was to be substituted. There is, however, no special Lenten character about the latter. *Benedicite* is peculiarly appropriate for Septuagesima, when the Lessons tell of Creation. The grouping of verses in the Canadian Prayer Book, with permission to sing " praise him, and magnify him for ever " at the end of each group is intelligible, but not so simple as the Sarum arrangement, according to which the response was sung after every third verse. The English Revision permits the omission of the response except after verses 1, 2, 17, 18, 26, 32. The American and Scottish Books provide a second alternative Canticle here: *Benedictus es Domine*—" Blessed art thou, O Lord God of our fathers "—which consists of the six verses immediately preceding *Benedicite* in " The Song of the three holy Children " in the Apocrypha. It has the advantage of brevity. The English Revision gives Psalm li as an alternative. The Irish Revision (1927) inserts as an alternative the Canticle *Urbs Fortitudinis* (Isaiah xxvi. 1–8).

The fitness of singing *Benedictus* after the Second Lesson is thus expressed by Dr. Frere: " As by singing *Te Deum* after the Lesson from the Old Testament we declare that the ancient promises were fulfilled in the incarnation and atonement of our Saviour, and acknowledge the glory of the eternal Trinity; so, after the Lesson from the histories of the New Testament, we praise God for the fulfilment of His promises in the inspired words of the father of John the Baptist, which may be called one of the earliest of the Christian hymns."

The *Jubilate* was inserted as an alternative to the

Benedicite in 1552. It could hardly have been intended to supersede the New Testament hymn which commemorates the Incarnation, but it certainly did so to a large extent. Sparrow regards the *Jubilate* as a simple alternative ; Wheatly says it was appointed for "variety," and, according to Shepherd, in the latter part of the eighteenth century the *Benedictus* had almost gone out of use. "It is seldom read," he says, "after the Second Lesson. In its place, with the greatest propriety we generally use the 100th Psalm." Barry says of the *Jubilate* that "(unlike the *Benedictus*) it has, from the nature of the case, no Christian reference; and it should not be made, as it often is made, the Canticle of regular use."

The Canticles at Evensong, *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*, which have been in liturgical use for about fifteen centuries, should have preference over their Old Testament alternatives. "After reading the Old Testament," writes Bishop Frere, "we have the Song of Mary, testifying to the fulfilment of God's promises of mercy to the fathers; and after the chapter from the New Testament, and there beholding how the promises were fulfilled in the propagation of the Gospel among the Gentiles, we express our readiness to receive that Gospel for ourselves in the song of the aged Simeon, and our faith that by so doing we shall have peace in our death, of which every night brings a type in sleep." The *Cantate* and *Deus Misereatur* may fitly be used on special occasions which seem to call for them. "All the ends of the world" in the former, and "Thy saving health among all nations," in the latter, make them suitable for Missionary services; and the *Cantate*, as Freeman points out, has a fitness for the Epiphany season. Sparrow's idea that these Psalms should be used in Lent and Advent, "which, being times of humiliation and meditation on Christ as in expectation, or His sufferings, are not so fitly enlarged with the songs of highest festivity," is questionable, for the festal character of the *Cantate* especially is strongly marked. The American Book gives Psalm xcii. as a second alternative for *Magnificat*, and Psalm ciii., 1–7, for the *Nunc Dimittis.*[1]

---

[1] The American Church is peculiar in printing the *Gloria in Excelsis*, from the Communion Service, for optional use at Evensong after the Psalms.

CHAPTER V

OF MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER (ii) AND LITANY

The Creed

THE recitation of the Creed, after the Lessons and just before the prayers, serves a double purpose, for it is both a declaration of our acceptance of the truth which has been read to us from Holy Scripture and an affirmation of the faith upon which our prayers are based. It is in the singular number, for all say it together, and each confesses for himself that belief in Christ which alone can make his prayers effectual. When we have individually said "I believe in God" we can say collectively, as fellow-members of His family, "Our Father." In the Breviary Offices of the Church of England the Creed was said privately up to the last two clauses, which were said as a versicle and response, all kneeling. The custom of kneeling for the Creed was retained in the Prayer Book of 1549, and it seems from the rubric that it was said "in a loud voice," by the Minister only. The Nicene Creed in the service of Holy Communion was always said aloud.

It would perhaps not be carrying us too far afield to discuss briefly the meaning and use of Creeds in general. A Creed—from the Latin word *credo*, "I believe"—is a short summary of the belief necessary for a Christian. The men and women who sought to enter the Church in Apostolic days were required to confess their faith in Christ. "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" the Ethiopian eunuch asked St. Philip (Acts viii. 36), and he replied: "If thou believest with all thy heart thou mayest." Then the eunuch said his Creed, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," and received baptism.[1] There was a "form of sound words" (2 Tim. i. 13) which St. Paul required to be held fast, and in another place (Rom. vi. 17) he alluded to a "form of doctrine which was delivered." "We may feel sure," says Dr. Lumby in the *Prayer Book Commentary*, "that from the first there existed in the Church a brief form of doctrine such as we now understand by the word *Creed*, and that it could not have been very different in character from the Apostles' Creed."

There are three Creeds in our Prayer Book, known respectively as the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian Creed; but the first was not compiled by the Apostles, the second is not that of the Council of Nicæa, and the third was not written by St. Athanasius.

The *Apostles' Creed* is the Baptismal Creed of the West, and is found in various forms from the second century onward. Rufinus (410) and Augustine (430) wrote expositions of it for the instruction of those who were preparing for baptism. Some changes were made later, but they are not of great importance. This Creed is very properly called the Apostles' Creed,

[1] This incident is not found in the oldest manuscripts, and so is omitted from the text of the Revised Version. But, if not from St. Luke's pen, it is a very early addition to the text and shows the practice of the primitive Church.

for it contains the body of doctrine taught by the Apostles. It was the Creed of the people, and (in the Church of England at least) was regarded as one of the things which it was essential to teach every Christian as he grew up; an English translation was prepared for that purpose by the Venerable Bede (735).

The name of the *Nicene Creed* may be justified on the ground that it embodies the point of doctrine defined in the original Creed of Nicæa (325) as a corrective of the Arian heresy, which taught that our Blessed Lord was not God in the true sense but was a created being. The Creed of Nicæa was made from the Creed formerly in use in Cæsarea, with some additions and alterations for the safeguarding of the faith as it had been received. As set forth by the Council it ended with the words, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." Fresh heresies made the addition of further clauses necessary, and the fuller Creed was authoritatively put forth by the Council of Chalcedon (451). Subsequently the words "and from the Son"—commonly called the *Filioque* clause—were inserted in Spain before the eighth century, perhaps by inadvertence, and certainly with no intention of altering the faith, and were adopted by the whole Western Church. This gave occasion for the division between East and West, but it is admitted generally now that, though the clause in question is capable of a wrong interpretation, no difference of doctrine really exists. Two variations from the text have crept into our Creed—the addition of the words "I believe" before "one Catholic and Apostolic Church," and the omission of the word "Holy" before "Catholic." In the Alternative Order of the Communion in the

1928 English Book and in the Scottish and South African Rites the word "Holy" is restored. The Nicene Creed is, by general use, the special Creed of the Eucharist, and the American Church stands alone in permitting it to be used instead of the Apostles' Creed at Morning and Evening Prayer.

The Quicunque Vult, or "Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of St. Athanasius," while it sets forth the faith for which Athanasius contended, originated in the West; perhaps it was written by St. Ambrose (397). It is not strictly a Creed, but rather a hymn of faith, written at a time when that faith was endangered by false teachers who denied the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity and of the Incarnation as set forth by the Church's Councils. Men's feelings ran high as they were contending earnestly for the faith, and as we sing the *Quicunque* to-day it should be with the remembrance that it was the battle-song of an earlier age, when the Church realized perhaps better than we do to-day that "straight is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life," and that there is salvation only in Christ, who Himself said: "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" (John viii. 24). There are two distinct sections of this Creed—the first of which treats of the Trinity and the second of the Incarnation—and there is ground for thinking that they were originally separate forms. As to its liturgical use: "The Church of England," says Dr. Burn, "alone uses the Creed in the mother tongue in a popular service," and "our modern use does not at all correspond to the ancient." It formed part of the daily service of Prime in the Sarum Use, and was said in Latin. In the Prayer Book of 1549 it was sung or said after *Benedictus* on special days, and it was not till 1662 that it was substituted for the Apostles' Creed. The American Prayer Book omits it altogether. The English Revision has a corrected version, made by eminent scholars, which is also given in the Scottish and Canadian Books. The new English Book makes the use of this " Creed " optional, on a number of days. The Scottish prescribes its use on Trinity Sunday. The Canadian gives it as an alternative to the Apostles' Creed at Morning Prayer.

Quite apart from any rubrical directions there are several ceremonial acts so widely prevalent at the saying of the Creed that they call for comment.

1. First is that of turning to the East, or what is called the " ecclesiastical East," where Churches are not properly built, according to the English custom, with the Chancel towards the East. In the early Church it was the custom at baptism for candidates to turn to the West, the region of darkness, to renounce the devil, and then to the East to profess their faith. " Our custom of turning to the East when saying the Apostles' Creed," writes Bishop Maclean in the *Prayer Book Dictionary*, " comes from transferring this baptismal custom to other offices; " and he adds: " It seems desirable not to turn to the East specially for the Athanasian Creed, as that Canticle is arranged for antiphonal singing." A note in Proctor and Frere's *New History of Book of Common Prayer* says: " There is less reason for turning at the Nicene Creed, and none at all for turning at Quicunque." It is a peculiarly Anglican custom, which grew up in the seventeenth century and

has no pre-Reformation precedent whatever. Sparrow does not mention it, but Bishop Wilson, of Sodor and Man, tells us that when he was ordained (1687) he was directed to "turn towards the East when the *Gloria Patri* and the Creeds are rehearsing." Wheatly, writing early in the eighteenth century, says: "When we repeat [the Creed] it is customary to turn towards the East," and Shepherd, at the end of the eighteenth century, says: "In the recital of the Creed it was customary to turn towards the Chancel or eastern part of the edifice. This ancient custom . . . is still retained by many of our congregations." In later Georgian days the custom almost died out, but it has been revived again during the last half-century. In matters of ceremonial, as in other matters, fashions change, and this is one of the ecclesiastical fashions which are popular at the present day, and involves no principle at all. In favour of the practice it may be said: (*a*) It is orderly and seemly; (*b*) it has English precedent to back it; (*c*) to quote Bishop Barry, "In the recitation of the Creed as a *symbolum* or watchword of Christian warfare there is a special appropriateness in the marshalling of all, as one army of Christ, towards the East"; (*d*) it is in accordance with prevailing ecclesiastical usage, and violates no rubric. On the other hand, it may be said: (*a*) No rubric or Canon enjoins the custom; (*b*) it was unknown in the Church before the Reformation; (*c*) it is not Catholic, for it is not observed either in the Roman or Eastern Church.

2. Bowing at the name of *Jesus* is enjoined by Canon 18 of 1604, which orders: "When in time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and

lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed." "The custom which obtains in many churches of bowing at the name of Jesus *only in the Creeds* is entirely without authority" (*Prayer Book Dictionary*). A Canon of the Episcopal Church in Scotland directs that "All persons attending Divine Service shall bow devoutly at the name of Jesus, especially in the Creeds."

3. Signing with the Cross at the Creed is a custom that of late years is very widespread. The Rev. Vernon Staley, sometime Provost of Inverness Cathedral, whom no one will accuse of Puritanical prejudice, and whose liturgical scholarship is unquestionable, tells us: "As far as the writer knows, there is positively no evidence whatever to be gained from the Service Books of East or West for the signing at the conclusion of the Apostles' Creed. . . . It cannot be defended by any appeal either to authority or precedent, but appears to rest merely upon the sentiment of private individuals." It would then come properly under the charitable direction of the first Prayer Book, "to be used or left as every man's devotion serveth, without blame." The use of this sign in private devotion at least can claim venerable antiquity, for Tertullian wrote at the end of the second century: "In all our travels and movements, in all our coming in and going out, in putting on our sandals, at the bath, at the table, in lighting our candles, in lying down, in sitting, whatever occupation engages us, we mark our foreheads with the sign of the Cross."

The Service of Prayer

The mutual salutation, "The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit," marks the transition to a new part of the service—the service of prayer. The salutation is that of Boaz to the reapers at Bethlehem (Ruth ii. 4), and the response is from the last verse of the 2nd Epistle to Timothy. In slightly varying form this salutation has been used both in East and West from earliest days, and it occurred several times in the Communion Service of 1549, and is restored in the 1928 English Book, but in the Book of 1662 it is retained only here and in the Confirmation Office. Shepherd explains its significance thus: "Before we begin to pray, the salutation of the priest reminds the people that without God's assistance their service cannot be profitably performed. . . . The people, remembering that their minister is going to present his supplications and to offer up spiritual sacrifices for them, pray in return that the same Lord may be graciously present with him at all times, and especially in the performance of these holy duties. And when the minister and the people, with proper dispositions, thus acknowledge their own insufficiency, declare their mutual love and charity, and reciprocally pray for each other, they will assuredly obtain a blessing from God."

The words "Let us pray" (the Latin *Oremus*), which follow the mutual salutation, stand as a general bidding to the prayers which follow. In the first Prayer Book they were not placed there, but at the end of the versicles and immediately before the Collect. Compare their positions in the other offices: in the latter part of the Litany, in Holy Communion, at Baptism, Confirmation, the Solemnization of Matrimony and Commination. Sparrow says: "These words, as they are an invitation to prayer in general, so they may seem to be sometimes an invitation to another form of petitioning, as in the Litany and other places; it being as much as to say, Let us collect our alternate supplications by versicles and answer into collects and prayers." So the words are fitly used before a Collect.

The three sentences which follow are commonly called the Lesser Litany. "It is to be observed," says Wheatly, "that the Church hath such awful reverence for the Lord's Prayer that it seldom suffers it to be used without some preceding preparation. . . . We are taught first to bewail our unworthiness, and pray for mercy, and then with humble boldness to look to heaven and call God *Our Father*." And he describes these petitions as "a short litany or supplication to every person in the blessed Trinity: we have offended each person and are to pray to each, and therefore we beg help from them all."

It is fitting and proper that the Lord's Prayer should come in here at the beginning of the service of prayer, for it is, as Tertullian (*c.* 200) expresses it, the foundation on which our other petitions are built. It is here, and not in the introductory part of the service, that it properly belongs. As already noted, it was said privately before certain of the ancient offices, which actually began with the versicles. "The public use of the Lord's Prayer in the Breviary," says Bishop Drury, in the *Prayer Book Dictionary*, "was at the commencement of the definite service of prayer which followed the Psalms and Lessons. This is found in *Prime* and *Compline*, on which our Mattins and Evensong are partly based. Prefaced by the Lesser Litany, and followed by Versicles and Collects, it forms the normal sequence of a service of intercession in the Western Church, and is retained as such in our own daily services." The words of a writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* several years ago on this point are worth quoting here: "Surely the central Lord's Prayer is the very core and kernel of the whole office, the one absolutely essential feature, the point from which all else before and after has radiated in exact correspondence with its own structure: Praise first, in the Psalms, etc., to answer to 'Hallowed be Thy name;' then reading of the Word, answering to 'Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done;' and prayer afterwards, answering to the later petitions." The omission of the central Lord's Prayer from Evening Prayer in the American Prayer Book is greatly to be regretted.

After the Lord's Prayer came the *Preces*—a Latin term for the short petitions in the form of versicle and response which were said in ancient times before the Collects. In these the people take their part and exercise their priesthood. "It refresheth their attention," says Sparrow, "it teaches them their part in public prayers; not to stand by and censure how well their priest plays the mouth of the congregation." The priest is directed to stand, for his office is one of authority. He is the representative of the people, presenting their prayers before God. The words "*all kneeling*" in the rubric following (introduced in 1662) are not to be taken as referring to the minister, but to the people, and were intended "to put an end to the unseemly custom introduced by the Puritans of the congregation sitting during the prayers." Up to 1662 it was the universal practice for the priest to stand for the Collects. The rubric is corrected in the 1928 English Book to read, "the people kneeling."

The Collects

Three Collects follow the Preces both at Morning and Evening Prayer, the first variable, "the same that is appointed at the Communion," and the others fixed. The Collect for the day is "a link connecting the Daily Offices with the Office for Holy Communion." If the question be asked, What is a Collect? we may say first that it is a peculiarly Western type of prayer, and seems to have originated in the Roman Church in the fifth century. It was, according to one explanation, the summing up of the silent petitions of the congregation, which had previously been "bidden" under various heads, and the people expressed their assent by saying *Amen*. The term is used in rather a broad sense in the Prayer Book, and is applied to the prayer for the King in the Communion Office, the prayer for All Conditions of Men, and others which cannot with strict propriety be called Collects. Canon Bright thus explains this fact: "Evidently some of these so-called Collects do not really belong to the class; and they were only called so at the last revision of the Prayer Book, when the sense of what a Collect should be had become far less distinct than in the time of Cranmer, and even learned ecclesiastical scholars like Cosin had ceased to appreciate the conciseness of the old models."

The Collects are nearly always addressed to God the Father, the exceptions being those for the 3rd Sunday in Advent, St. Stephen's Day, and the 1st Sunday in Lent, and also that for the 4th Sunday in Advent in its restored form in the Canadian Prayer Book. Bingham says: "It was designed that when the Sacrifice of Christ was commemorated, He should be considered as the great Mediator, by whose Sacrifice we apply to the Father, and have access by His merits and intercessions to the throne of grace and mercy; and therefore all prayers at the Altar are ordered to be directed to the Father in His Name."

The general structure of the Collects is on a threefold plan: (1) the invocation, often making mention of some Divine attribute as the ground for our prayer; (2) the petition itself, to which is sometimes added a clause anticipating the results which will follow; (3) the pleading of Christ's Name, in which alone our prayer can be acceptable. In the editions of the Prayer Book previous to 1662 the Collects were left without their endings, concluding with "Through," and leaving the minister to fill in the ascription of glory to the Blessed Trinity according to the accustomed forms. When the terminations were appended at the last revision, only a few were given complete, as the Advent Collect, "through him who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, now and ever;" the 3rd Sunday in Advent: "who livest and reignest with the Father and the Holy Spirit, ever one God, world without end"; Christmas Day: "through . . . who liveth and reigneth with thee and the same Spirit, ever one God, world without end;" Easter, Septuagesima and the Ascension Collects: "Through . . . who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end." Why this ascription was omitted from the other Collects it is difficult to say, unless it was intended that they should be completed after the model of those given.

Dr. Bright says of the Collects, in *The Prayer Book Commentary*: "Surely Leo the Great, or whoever it was that wrote the earliest Collect, did for Western piety a thing greater than he knew. . . . A really good and characteristic Collect takes hold of the hearer or reader at many points. The careful selection of words, the artistic adjustment of clauses, the melodies which haunt the ear and live in the heart, the force which comprehends so much in so little—yet more, the chastened sobriety of tone, and the tranquil solemnity which is the more pathetic for not being effusive—these fulfil an important function in what may be called the education of the human spirit. They satisfy the sense of religious beauty; they stock the mind with holy memories; they witness for the duty of not being hasty to utter anything in devotion; they warn against dangerous freedom, and check the luxuriance of devout sentiment; they hint at the vastness of Divine truth in comparison with men's attempt to speak of it; they make the soul's conscious approaches to God more steadily reverent, and therefore more healthily real."

The second and third Collects both at Morning and Evening Prayer are taken from the old Roman Sacramentaries, and come down to us through the Sarum Breviary. The morning and evening Collects for Peace differ in character, the former being for outward peace and the latter for that inward peace " which passeth all understanding." With these Collects, Mattins and Evensong in the first Prayer Book ended.

Anthems and Hymns

The rubric which directs, " *In Quires and Places where they sing here followeth the Anthem*," is broadly interpreted as sanctioning the insertion of a hymn at this place, and in the Canadian book it has been changed to " *Here may follow an Anthem or Hymn.*"[1] The term *Anthem* is the English form of " *Antiphon*," and is described as " musical responds of praise or prayer, frequently appended to Collect, Psalm, or Lesson." In the modern acceptation of the term, it is a piece of sacred music, with harmonies, set to words of Holy Scripture, composed for singing at Divine Service, and differs somewhat from the word *Hymn*, which implies, as we use it now, a metrical composition, sung generally to a melody which is repeated with every verse.

In the pre-Reformation Service Books there were a number of Office Hymns, some of them very beautiful, adapted to the various seasons of the Christian year. In most of the offices these were placed just before the Psalms. The reason these were left out of our Prayer Book was not because its compilers disapproved of them but simply because there were no poets among them who could turn these Office Hymns into good English. A writer in the *Prayer Book Dictionary* says: " Cranmer attempted to translate these Latin hymns and confessed his failure. One unsatisfactory translation only, and that not from his hand, was included in the new English Prayer Book (the alternative *Veni Creator* in the Ordinal)." If such translations as those of John Mason Neale and others which are found in our hymn-books to-day had then been available, there is no doubt we should have had in our Prayer Book fixed Office Hymns of real devotional value, such as "O Heavenly Word, Eternal Light," for Advent; "Of the Father's Love begotten," for Christmas; "Light's glittering morn," for Easter; "The eternal gifts of Christ the King," for feasts of Apostles.

---

[1] The American Book has provision for the Anthem at Evening Prayer only, " where it may be convenient."

The Anthem after the third Collect was not intended to take the place of the Office Hymn before the Psalms. The rubric concerning it was only added in 1662, more than a century after the Office Hymn had disappeared. One writer suggests that it was part of the provision for additional prayers after the Collects, and he says: "The Anthem was, however, captured by the musicians and used for praise and prayer alike; it should be here a prayer." Another writer says: "The absence of hymns in the English Prayer Book, together with the disappearance of the Antiphons to the Psalms and Canticles, roused a strong feeling of need for music, which was met by the provision contained in the 49th Injunction of 1559, to the effect that in certain churches, music, in the form of a Hymn or Anthem, be permitted at the beginning or end of Morning and Evening Prayer." Dr. Frere says: "The direction for an Anthem properly belongs more to Evensong than to Mattins. In the latter part of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth the custom was growing up of singing a metrical psalm or hymn in parish churches at this point . . . but on liturgical and practical grounds alike the hymn would be more suitable placed at the end of the introductory part of the service."

The metrical Psalters of Sternhold and Hopkins (in the middle of the sixteenth century) and of Tate and Brady (1696) were issued under royal authority to be used in churches, with the result that—notwithstanding the fact that the custom has no rubrical sanction—hymns have been habitually introduced into various parts of the services.[1] There was a condition to the liberty of singing given in the first Act of Uniformity of "not letting or omitting thereby the service or any part thereof." This means that you may not (*e.g.*) substitute a hymn for the *Magnificat*, or leave out the Offertory Sentence because you want a hymn after the sermon.

It should not be forgotten with regard to hymns in general that they have only a legitimate place in the services of the Church as acts of public worship, and therefore should not be selected at random, or with the primary thought of the popularity of the tunes to which they are set. If we come to the House of God with the prayer that the words of our mouth and the meditation of our heart may be acceptable in His sight, we should take care that the hymns we sing are not expressions of unreal sentiments.

Popular hymns are not necessarily good hymns; and, as it was required under the Old Dispensation that what was offered to God should be found, after careful examination, to be without blemish, it behoves us no less carefully to examine the hymns to be sung to see that they are suitable to be offered. This is one of the things for which the parish priest is responsible. *Objective* hymns are those which are directly addressed to God, or are centred upon Him, in contrast with *subjective* hymns, which dwell chiefly upon our own feelings and experience.

---

[1] The Irish Book sanctions the singing of an anthem or a hymn at the Offertory in addition to the saying of the sentence.

"Come, let us join our cheerful songs
With angels round the throne,"

is objective. We forget ourselves in the contemplation of our glorified Lord; but "Come, ye disconsolate," is subjective, and its appeal is to men first of all. Or contrast these two: "Hail to the Lord's Anointed," with no thought but the honour and glory of Him to whom it is addressed, and "Hark, hark, my soul," which has sweet words, the meaning of which, if there is any meaning, is difficult to analyze. Subjective hymns, many of them, are good and edifying, and have their place; but they should not be sung as Office Hymns before the Psalms, or after the third Collect, in the place of the Anthem, for they are not acts of worship.

The propriety of singing "*Amen*" at the end of every hymn is very questionable. It comes fitly after a Doxology, but after most hymns it is both unnecessary and unmeaning.

The Prayers after the Anthem

The "five Prayers following" in the English Prayer Book were first printed here in 1662. The American and Canadian Books remove the *Prayer for all Conditions* *of Men* and the *General Thanksgiving* from the Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings, and insert them here.[1] The English 1928 Book gives direction that after the third Collect the service may end " with one or more of the Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings and such others as are authorized by the Bishop," concluding with the prayer of St. Chrysostom and the Grace, " or with one of the alternative conclusions," which are provided. The Irish Book inserts, after the prayer for the Royal Family, one for " the *Chief Governour or Governours of Ireland*," and the Canadian Revision has one for the *Governor-General* and the *Lieutenant-Governors*. The Scottish Book has a comprehensive prayer for the *King's Majesty*, the *Royal Family*, the *Ministers of the Crown*, etc., to be used instead of the separate prayers, and the Canadian Book has a similar form. The *Prayer for the Clergy and People* is a very ancient one, coming from the Sacramentary of Gelasius (492). The phrase in the old translation, " Who alone workest great marvels," refers, no doubt, to the supernatural gifts of the early Church, and " curates " signifies those who have the " cure " or care of souls. Strangely enough, in modern days the word " curate " has come to signify one who exercises his spiritual office under a rector or incumbent and is not instituted to the cure of souls. The original meaning survives in French, where the *curé* has charge of the parish, and the *vicaire* is our " curate."

The " *Prayer of St. Chrysostom*," taken from the Greek Liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, was placed by Cranmer at the end of the Litany in 1544, and when the other prayers were added after the Anthem, this prayer and the "Grace" were appended as a fitting close to the service, which previously ended abruptly with the third Collect. The old service ending for the Hour-Services was a versicle and response: "Let us bless the Lord;" "Thanks be to God."

---

[1] But the Minister may end the service at his discretion with any prayers " taken out of this Book."

It is just before the prayer of St. Chrysostom that Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings are to be inserted, as need may require. These are printed after the Litany, and call for no special comment, except perhaps the *Prayer for all Conditions of Men*, which, with the *General Thanksgiving*, has been incorporated into Mattins and Evensong in the American and Canadian Books. The Irish Book prints the *Prayer for all Conditions of Men*, but not the *General Thanksgiving*, after the Prayer for the Clergy, and the rubric says it *may* be used. This prayer is said to have been composed by Bishop Gunning, and was probably longer in its original form, being designed to satisfy the desires of the Puritans, who objected to the Litany and wanted one long prayer in its place. Convocation apparently cut out some of the clauses, but the word "*finally*" indicates that a number of petitions had gone before it. All recent revisions of the Prayer Book have additional Prayers for various occasions, which are very useful. In all except the American, forms of Bidding—"let us pray," etc.—are provided. In the new English Book there is a form of Bidding and a versicle and response before each of the Occasional Prayers: thus—"Let us pray for the King.

V. Send him help from the Sanctuary;
R. And strengthen him out of Sion."

The permission of the *English Shortened Service Act* (1872) to omit on week-days (except Christmas Day, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday and Ascension Day) the Exhortation, *Venite*, all Psalms but one, either Lesson (unless proper), either Canticle, the Lesser Litany and Lord's Prayer following, and the prayers after the third Collect, except the Prayer of St. Chrysostom and the Grace, has been repeated by the Irish and Canadian Prayer Books with questionable propriety, and the American and Scottish Books permit the omission (when Holy Communion follows Mattins) of the Exhortation, Confession, Absolution and Lord's Prayer. The English 1928 Book and the Scottish Book permit the Minister to begin Mattins or Evensong (when another Service provided in the Book immediately follows) at the Versicle " O Lord, open thou our lips," and to end with the Canticle after the Second Lesson; or he may add the Salutation, and the words " Let us pray," followed by the second or third Collect.

The Litany

The term " Litany " signifies " a form of prayer in dialogue, either stationary or processional." There were litanies in English before Cranmer's time; but they were in brief sentences, each with its response " Lord, have mercy upon us," or " We beseech thee to hear us." Our Litany, compiled in 1544, has undergone but little change. It was at first ordered to be used " before high mass, the priest with other of the quire kneeling in the midst of the church." This was because of " contention and strife " and " challenging of places in procession," but was evidently only a temporary regulation, for it was sung in procession both in London and St. George's, Windsor, in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign. The direction that it should be sung or said " After Morning Prayer " was not inserted until 1662. We are left now without rubrical direction as to how or where it is to be used. Were the people to kneel or was the processional use to be restored, as is done at St. Paul's Cathedral and elsewhere on special occasions now? And, if it was to be said all kneeling, where was the priest to kneel? There is only a side-light thrown upon the question by a rubric in the Commination Service, " *Then shall they all kneel* (*the Priest in the place where he is accustomed to say the Litany*)." The low desk or faldstool, which is now used for the Litany in many churches, was unknown till about 1600. " Originally," says the *Prayer Book Dictionary*, " the reader knelt before the Holy Table without support." However, Cosin in visitation articles as Archdeacon (1627), inquired: " Have you a little faldstool, or desk, with some decent carpet over it, in the middle alley of the church, whereat the Litany may be said? " and in the frontispiece of Sparrow's *Rationale* (1657) the reader is kneeling at a desk at some distance from the Altar, and below are the words: " The Litany to be said in the midst of the Church."

The rubric preceding the Lord's Prayer in the Litany makes mention of " the Priest," but there is no direction as to the minister who is to take the former part. Whether it was intended or not, it has been held that a deacon or layman may say the former part, and there is a custom of long standing in some English churches—Lincoln Cathedral, for example—of one or two choristers kneeling at Litany desk to sing the former part, a priest in one of the stalls taking it up at the Lord's Prayer. Sparrow and Wheatly are strangely at variance as to the propriety of this. The latter says: "The singing of this office by laymen, as practised in several cathedrals and colleges, is certainly very unjustifiable and deservedly gives offense to all such as are zealous for regularity and decency in Divine Service," and he quotes from Dr. Bennet, who characterizes this custom as "most scandalous," "illegal," "abominable in itself, and a flat contradiction to all primitive order." Sparrow, on the other hand, refers to the ancient Eastern custom of the deacon saying a litany in the Liturgy, and says: "In the former part of the litany the Priest hath not a part so proper but that it may be said by a deacon, or other . . . but in the latter part . . . from the Lord's Prayer to the end, the Priest hath a part more peculiar, by reason of the eminency of that prayer; and other Collects follow where the Priest doth recommend again the petitions of the people to God."

The Litany is properly a service by itself, and in the year 1558 Bishop Jewel issued an injunction for a daily service to be said at 5 p.m. in Salisbury Cathedral, consisting of the Confession and Absolution and Litany to the end of the Collect "O God, merciful Father," after which was to be read a chapter of the Bible, and then the Litany was concluded, the Priest beginning "O Lord, arise, help us." The prevalent notion that these words are intimately connected with the preceding Collect and are used instead of the *Amen* is a mistaken one. Not only does the injunction alluded to show this, but the rubric following the Absolution at Mattins directs that " *The people shall answer here, and at the end of all other prayers*, Amen." The English (1928) and Scottish Books insert the *Amen;* and the Antiphon, " O Lord, arise," is to be said by Minister and people, and is repeated after the *Gloria.*

The facsimile copy of the Manuscript Prayer Book of 1662 has a space after the Collect and before the following words, which are an Antiphon to the Psalm, " O God, we have heard." The American Prayer Book permits the shortening of the Litany, at the Minister's discretion, by omitting all that follows the Lord's Prayer to the Prayer " We humbly beseech thee; " the Scottish Book permits the omission, before Holy Communion, of the Lord's Prayer and all that follows except the Prayer of St. Chrysostom and Grace; the Canadian permission is similar, but the Lord's Prayer is retained. In the 1928 Book, after the Invocation the suffrages are divided into three sections: the first, " Remember not," etc., the second, " By the mystery," etc., the third, " We sinners do beseech thee," etc.; and the rubric preceding the Litany directs that " The Minister may, at his discretion, after the opening Invocations, say such of the Suffrages as he thinks convenient, provided that some are drawn from each section, and that all are concluded by 'Son of God, we beseech thee to hear us,' " etc. What follows after the Lord's Prayer has the heading " A Supplication," and its use is permissive. It may be used separately on Rogation Days and in times of trouble. Ordinarily the Litany ends with the prayer of St. Chrysostom and the Grace after the Lord's Prayer. In the General Directions for Public Worship in the Irish Book permission is given, when the Communion is to follow, to omit the intercessions from that for the King to " That it may please thee to give to all nations," etc.[1]

The Litany has one marked peculiarity, that all the petitions in the first part, preceding the Lord's Prayer, with the exception of the Invocations to the Blessed Trinity, are addressed directly to our Lord Jesus Christ. This is at variance with Christian worship in general, but follows the precedent of ancient Litanies. " Taken in connection with the opening Invocations," says Bishop Barry, " this part of the Litany may be considered as our most solemn prayer for His mediation." This part of the Litany contains three forms of petitions, which are commonly distinguished as *Deprecations*, *Obsecrations* and *Intercessions*. The first are prayers against evil, the second plead the redemptive work of Christ and pray that in consideration of all that He has done and sacrificed for us, He will grant our requests. The Intercessions are for different conditions of men, for the various gifts and graces which we need, and for help in all our trials and adversities.

New suffrages are added in the recent revisions, all of which restore in substance the clause contained in the Litany of the English Primer of 1535, " That thou vouchsafe to send plenty of faithful workmen in thy harvest." There was a petition in the mediæval litanies that death may not come upon us unprepared, which is not adequately expressed in our phrase " from sudden death." It may be noted that at Ordinations the prayer of St. Chrysostom and "Grace" are omitted where Holy Communion immediately follows. The Canadian Revision incorporates the General Thanksgiving in the Litany.

---

[1] The Scottish Book (1929) provides two new Litanies, one a shortened form of the Litany in the Book of 1662, and the other a new and still shorter form, with a pause for silent prayer and the response " Lord have mercy " after each bidding.

CHAPTER VI

OF THE HOLY COMMUNION (i)

General Introduction

THE service of the Holy Communion is the chiefest and most distinctively Christian of all services, for it was instituted by our Blessed Lord Himself, and there has never been a Lord's Day since that on which the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the disciples in the upper room at Jerusalem that Christians have not met together for the "breaking of bread." From the earliest times the observance of this service was marked by the greatest reverence and devotion, and not only attendance at the service but the partaking of the Holy Sacrament was regarded as a primary Christian duty. The evidence of history is such as to leave no doubt on these two points: (1) that it was a custom of the undivided Church for three centuries at least, that wherever there was a Christian congregation the Eucharist was celebrated every Sunday, and (2) that all those present partook of it.

It is to be noted that in all the early liturgies the service consisted of two parts: (*a*) the *Catechumens' Service*, which those who were not baptized but were looking forward to baptism might attend, and (*b*) the *Service of the Faithful*. So distinct were these two divisions that it was not an uncommon practice for different congregations in a town to attend their own church for the preliminary service and afterwards assemble at the mother church for the service proper. Of the many liturgies to be found in the East, not a few consist of this second part only, a general form of Catechumens' Service being common to all. The first part would correspond very nearly with our Ante-Communion Service, consisting of Lessons, with Psalms or Canticles between, a Sermon and Prayers, especially on behalf of those about to be dismissed. At the close of this service, one of the Deacons called out with a loud voice from the pulpit, directing all those who were unbaptized or under censure to leave the church, and only the faithful communicants remained for the solemn celebration of the Eucharist. The one exception to this rule was that there was a class of penitents who were excluded from the communion and the offerings but were permitted to be present while the others communicated. St. Chrysostom (407) in one of his sermons, rebukes those who remain but do not communicate, saying they were as unworthy of the prayers in which they joined as of the reception which they declined.

The "godly discipline" of the early Church is lost and there is no hope that it will be restored. There are no catechumens in our home congregations now and no direction for any to withdraw; but, on the other hand, the Invitation ("Ye that do truly," etc.) in the latter part of our Prayer Book service seems to assume that all those present intend to communicate. Was it supposed that those who were not baptized would have gone out before this?

St. Augustine (430) and other early writers speak of the Holy Communion as the "sacred mysteries," and the same term is used in our Thanksgiving after Communion—"who have duly received these holy mysteries"—and in the long exhortation—"consider the dignity of that holy mystery." Now the word "*mystery*" signifies something which is not common to all, but to the initiated only. Gregory Nazianzen (390) says: "Jesus Himself in the upper room imparted of the mystery to those initiated in the higher things." If then we would walk in the ways of the first centuries we should endeavour to bring it about that none but "the faithful" should be present at the celebration of the mysteries, and that all those present should communicate. "I have a strong feeling," wrote Keble in his *Letters of Spiritual Counsel*, "against the foreign custom of encouraging *all sorts of persons* to 'assist' at the Holy Eucharist without communicating. It seems to me open to two grave objections: it cannot be without danger of profaneness and irreverence to very many and of consequent dishonour to the Holy Sacrament, and it has brought in or encouraged, or both (at least so I greatly suspect), a notion of a quasi-sacramental virtue in such attendance, which I take to be a great part of the error stigmatized in our 31st Article."

Need we quarrel about Names?

Considerable variety is observable at different times and in different sections of the Church in the names given to this service. The earliest is that which we find in Acts (ii. 42, 46), "The Breaking of Bread." The term most common in the early centuries everywhere was *Eucharist*, which is a Greek word meaning Thanksgiving. Ignatius of Antioch uses it at the beginning of the second century, and Justin Martyr, writing from Rome about thirty years later, says: "This food is called among us the Eucharist." A little later the term *Liturgy*, which in its first Christian use signified any religious service, was restricted to this particular service, and when we speak now of the "early Liturgies" which have come down to us (as the Liturgies of St. James, St. Mark, St. Clement, St. Basil, St. Theodore and others), it is the service of the Holy Eucharist only which is meant. The Liturgy is the term used in the Greek Church at the present time.

The title given to the service in Cranmer's first Prayer Book (1549) was "*The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.*" This was changed in the second Prayer Book (1552) to the present title, "*The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion.*" The title of the Scottish Office is "*The Scottish Liturgy for the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist and Administration of Holy Communion.*"

The Lord's Supper is evidently taken from the passage in 1 Cor. xi. 20, of which Bishop Barry says: "From the context it seems doubtful whether the reference does not at least include the *Agape* or Love-feast following the Sacrament itself." There can be no doubt, however, that the term was used by St. Augustine and others of the Fathers of the Eucharistic feast, and the Roman Council of Trent (1545–63) notes that "some of the ancient Fathers sometimes called the sacred Eucharist also by the title of the 'Supper.'" The term was largely used at the time of the Reformation to remind people that the Eucharist was not an external thing, but as the Lord's command was " Take, eat . . . drink ye all of this," it was the privilege and duty of all the worshippers to be partakers of the sacred food.

The Holy Communion, which has now almost superseded the former title, is taken from 1 Cor. x. 16, where it properly signifies *participation*. " The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation of the Blood of Christ? " Scudamore, justifying the term, says : " Participation in the Eucharist is the great outward sign and pledge of *Communion* and fellowship with the Church." Hence admission to the Sacrament and to a recognized place in the Christian body were practically the same thing, and to be repelled from the one was to be excluded from the other. Hence it was natural that the Sacrament should be called the Communion even without direct reference to the language of St. Paul or to the reasons on which it was founded. Nevertheless, notwithstanding this twofold impulse, it was long before the Sacrament was called by this name.

The term *Mass*, which the first Prayer Book retained to show that the service was essentially the same as before, has been in use in the Western Church since the fourth century, and not only is it employed in the Roman Church to-day, but also by the Lutherans of Sweden and Denmark. It is the English form of the term used at the close of the service, when it is said: " *Ite, missa est* "—" Depart, it is the dismissal." To quote again from Scudamore: " It was unknown to the first ages of the Church, and it is unmeaning and inappropriate as a name of the Sacrament, to which it had accidentally attached itself." There is no doctrinal significance in the term to warrant its association in the popular mind with error and superstition. All that can be said to justify the use of the term is that it is brief, and has Western usage in its favour.

Another change in terminology was made by the revisers of 1552 when they substituted the word "Table" for "Altar." There was no repudiation of the latter term and its use never died out entirely in common parlance. The terms "Altar," "The Lord's Table" and "God's Board" were used indifferently in the Prayer Book of 1549, and the Act authorizing the use of the Prayer Book of 1552 declared the previous book to be "a very godly order, agreeable to the word of God and the Primitive Church." Ridley and Cranmer admitted the lawfulness of the term Altar, and Latimer said: "It may be called an Altar, and so the Doctors call it in many places." The reason for the disuse of the term was, as Canon Warren puts it, "to disabuse the minds of the common people of some grossly carnal notions as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice being a literal repetition of the Sacrifice on Calvary, and so bring back to the people's minds the great truth that the Eucharistic Service is a Feast as well as a Sacrifice, which the withdrawal of the cup from the laity and the solitary communion of the priest had tended to obscure." It is noteworthy that in the Coronation Service the term Altar has always been retained, and a Canon passed by Convocation in 1640 stated that the Holy Table "is and may be called an Altar by us in the sense in which the Primitive Church called it an Altar, and no other." About the same date Christopher Harvie wrote in *The Synagogue :*

> " Some call't the Altar, some the Holy Table.
> The name I stick not at,
> Whether 't be this or that
> I care not much, so that I may be able
> Truly to know
> Both why it is, and may be called so."

Dean Brevint thus explains (1673) the two terms: "To men it is a sacred Table where God's minister is ordered to represent from God, his Master, the Passion of His dear Son, as still fresh and still powerful for their eternal salvation; and to God it is an Altar whereon men mystically present Him the same Sacrifice." So Bishop Sparrow: "Now let no man take offence at the word Altar. Let him know that anciently both these names Altar or Holy Table were used for the same things, though most frequently the Fathers and Councils used the word Altar. And both are fit names for that holy thing: For the Holy Eucharist, being considered as a Sacrifice, in the representation of the breaking of the Bread and pouring forth the Cup, doing that to the holy symbols which was done to Christ's Body and Blood, and so showing forth and commemorating the Lord's death, and offering upon it the same Sacrifice that was offered upon the Cross, or rather the commemoration of that Sacrifice, may fitly be called an Altar, which again is as fitly called an holy Table, the Eucharist being considered as a sacrament, which is nothing else than a distribution and application of the sacrifice to the several receivers." Wheatly, somewhat later, says: "Altar was the name by which the holy Board was constantly distinguished for the first 300 years after Christ, during which time it does not appear that it was above once called Table. . . . Afterwards indeed both names came to be promiscuously used, the one having respect to the oblation of the Eucharist, the other to the participation." From the fourth century on there is no lack of the use of the term "Table." Speaking generally this term is preferred in the East, while "Altar" is more common in the West; Holy Table is the term used in the Eastern Churches at the present day.

The Holy Table and its Furnishings

When we come to ask what the altar, or table, is like, the Prayer Book gives no information, but only the general direction that "the Chancels shall remain as they have done in times past." This refers us to ecclesiastical tradition.

In the Primitive Church the altar was foursquare, set under a canopy (called a *ciborium*) supported by four pillars, between which curtains were hung, and on the top of the dome of the canopy was a cross. Customs, however, change from time to time, and in various places, and it is English tradition to which the Prayer Book refers us. This, as it refers to the subject in question, is well summed up by Mr. F. C. Eeles in the *Prayer Book Dictionary*. "In the average English parish church in later medieval times," he says, "the altar was very long, with curtains close to each end at right angles to the East wall, and a low reredos (or *upper frontal*) filling the space between the *mensa* and the base of the large window. . . . At the Reformation wooden Tables were substituted for those of stone. . . . These Tables were frequently ornamented exactly as the old stone altars had been, while in some places, under the influence of the more extreme Continental type of Reformers, they appear to have been arranged with seats all round for communicants. . . . The more common Elizabethan practice was to remove the Lord's Table into the middle of the choir for the Eucharist, the celebrant standing at its North Side as placed lengthwise for the occasion; at other times it remained in its ancient place. During the seventeenth century it became customary to leave it there at all services and to adorn it in the old way."

The 82nd canon of 1604 orders that the Lord's Table shall be covered with "a carpet of silk or other decent stuff." This is in accordance with a custom of very early times; how early it is impossible to say, but at least it was common in the days of St. Chrysostom (407). This custom has been generally followed throughout Christendom, but naked altars are common now in France and Belgium and in Roman churches in our midst, although they find no ecclesiastical sanction in the tradition of East or West.

The "carpet" covered not only the top, but the lower part as well, and the hanging or frontal, as it is called, was generally ornamented with some symbol or design in needlework. "The object intended," says the Rev. J. W. Tyrer, "is clearly reverence for the

Holy Table, and the innovation of leaving it bare, introduced in this country [England] in recent years, disregards this, as well as the custom of the Church Catholic and the express orders of the Church of England."

Canon 82 also orders "a fair linen cloth" at the time of the administration, and the rubric at the beginning of the Communion Service says: "The Table at the Communion time having a fair white linen cloth," etc. Both these directions imply that the fair linen cloth should be removed when the celebration is over, and this was the ancient custom. It would appear, however, that in some churches in England in Queen Elizabeth's reign this was not done, and in that case it was required that "some covering of silk or buckram or such-like" be laid upon the cloth "for the clean keeping thereof." The fashion of this fair linen cloth has varied at times. Sometimes it fell in ample folds over the front and ends; sometimes it came only a few inches over the front, but more generally it was the width of the altar, hanging down two feet or more at either end, and its ends were fringed. This is a mere matter of detail and involves no principle. It may be added that there is no authority or precedent in the English Church for the use of lace upon altar linen.

There is another "fair linen cloth" mentioned in the rubric after Communion, with which the priest is directed to cover what remains of the consecrated elements. This is not to be confused with the cloth with which the altar is covered. The Scottish Liturgy of

1637 directs the Priest to "cover with a fair linen cloth or *corporall*, that which remaineth." This is what is called the *corporas* in the Prayer Book of 1549. Originally (ecclesiastical antiquarians tell us) the corporal was long enough for the sacred vessels to be placed upon one end of it and the other end to be drawn up from behind for a covering, but for convenience it was divided in two, the elements for consecration being placed upon one, and the other being used as a covering.

The Lord's Table was looked upon in the early Church as too sacred for anything to be placed upon it but the holy vessels and the book of the Gospels. As before noted, there was a cross at the apex of the *ciborium* and lamps were suspended from its canopy. Later on the canopy disappeared, the cross was set up on the floor beside the altar, and the lamps were replaced by candles set upon the tops of the pillars, which were retained. After this came the use of a candle placed upon the altar for the Priest to read by, which was shifted as required. Later, two candles were provided, one at either end, and this use continued until the time of the Reformation. Most of the pictures representing the interiors of English churches before the Reformation show an altar with nothing on it (the vessels, of course, excepted) but these two lights, and sometimes only one. An Injunction of Edward VI, issued in 1547, ordered that no candles should be set before any image or picture, "but only two lights upon the high altar, before the Sacrament, which, for the signification that Christ is the true Light of the World, they shall suffer to remain still."

It is interesting here to notice how a symbolical meaning becomes attached to that which was at first utilitarian. Bishop Andrewes (1626) points this out in his *Answer to Cardinal Berron:* " There were *Lights*, there was *Incense* used by the Primitive Church in their service. Not for any mystical meaning, but (as is thought) for this cause: that where the Christians in time of persecution had their meetings most commonly in caves and grots underground, places dark and so needing *light*, and dampish and so needing savours, they were forced to provide *lights* against the one and *incense* against the other. After, when peace came, though they had churches then above-ground with light and air enough, yet they retained both the *lights* and the *incense*, to show themselves to be the sons and successors of those ancient Christians, which in former times had used them (though upon other occasion), showing their communion in the former faith by the communion of the former usages. Whereto the after ages devised meanings and significations of their own which from the beginning were not so."

This use of candles fell into abeyance for the most part in Queen Elizabeth's reign, but was revived in the reign of James I, continuing up to the time of the Rebellion. After the Restoration they were again restored, but in many cases were left unlighted. Bishop Cosin, in his notes on the Ornaments Rubric (1640), says: " These lights were (by virtue of this present rubric, referring to what was in use in the second of Edward VI) afterwards continued in all the Queen's chapels during her whole reign, and so they are in the

King's and in many Cathedral churches, besides the chapels of divers noblemen, bishops and colleges of this day. It is well known that the Lord-Treasurer Burleigh (who was no friend to superstition or popery) used them constantly in his chapel with other ornaments of fronts, palls and books upon his altar. The like did Bishop Andrewes, who was a man who well knew what he did, and as free from popish superstition as any in the kingdom besides." Archbishop Benson made a similar statement in pronouncing upon their legality in his judgment in the Lincoln case in 1890, citing numerous authorities in the Appendix. As a matter of fact, the traditional candlesticks upon the altar, whether the candles are lighted or unlighted, are found in every Cathedral of England to-day. Many of the most beautiful and massive of these are the product of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, as those of St. Paul's, Durham, Rochester, Exeter and Norwich, and among the treasures in the Cathedral in Quebec is a pair of heavy silver candlesticks for the Holy Table presented by King George III. It is not unusual to see a cross also upon the altar in the illustrations of mediæval English churches, but this is not the rule, and it was by no means considered a necessity. The setting of a crucifix upon the altar, Dr. Brightman says, is a Lutheran rather than a Catholic custom, and Mr. Staley says: "The extraordinary importance attached to having a cross upon the altar during the celebration of the Eucharist cannot claim support from antiquity, but the reverse. The common idea that an altar without a cross thereon is a mark of Protestantism is to be resolutely combated, as being untrue to historical fact."

Another custom which came in during the Middle Ages was that of decking the altar on special occasions with rich plate, as is still done at Westminster Abbey and elsewhere. An illustration in Dean Addison's (1703) *Introduction to the Sacrament* shows a preacher in the pulpit in black gown, and in the background an altar with two lighted candles on it and a large alms-bason set on edge in the centre. A large Bible printed at Oxford by John Baskett in 1716 shows on its title-page an altar with two large flagons, a chalice and paten and two candlesticks with candles not lighted.

Book-rests too, of wood or metal, were used, but cushions, for the most part of velvet, were generally preferred, as they did not injure but served to protect the costly bindings of the service books. These cushions when not used for this purpose were placed at either end of the table, and the custom grew up latterly of the clergy kneeling there and using them as rests for their elbows. Possibly this custom was brought in from Italy, as a similar one is found at the present day in Milan Cathedral.

The custom of placing flowers on or about the altar is of late introduction, and was certainly not known in the second year of Edward VI. From very early times, flowers were strewn about or hung in garlands about the church walls on festive occasions, but conspicuous brass vases and tin holders for the flowers are a departure from old tradition and, when used to excess, take away from the simplicity and dignity of the Lord's

Table. Where flower vases are used it has become customary to have a ledge or shelf (sometimes improperly called a *super-altar* or retable) upon which they are placed. This is convenient, and at least has as much authority as the vases themselves, but, as Staley remarks, " The custom of erecting a series of steps or gradines behind the altar upon which to place a multitude of illegal tapers and vases of flowers is a vulgar novelty and, as a defiance of the Ornaments Rubric, is not to be countenanced."

Another innovation which has come into favour, perhaps more largely in the American Church than elsewhere, is the placing of a " Tabernacle " on a shelf at the back of the altar for the reserved Sacrament. In the days when the Sacrament was commonly reserved in England, it was kept either in a pyx or in an aumbry, or locked cupboard, constructed in the wall on the north side of the sanctuary. The English 1928 Book provides that " the consecrated Bread and Wine [for the communion of the sick] shall be reserved in an aumbry or safe . . . set in the North or South wall of the sanctuary of the church or of any chapel thereof, or, if need be, in the wall of some other part of the church approved by the Bishop, provided that it shall not be immediately behind or above a Holy Table."

It is perhaps advisable to add a word as to the impropriety of a flight of high steps leading up to the Holy Table in a small church. Anyone who is familiar with old churches in England must recognize that such an arrangement is at variance with traditional usage. There should always be a foot-pace or platform, with a width of at least eighteen inches, in front of the altar, but it need not be more than four inches high, and in small churches this is quite enough inside the Chancel rail.

The Preparation

The Lord's Prayer and Collect, with which our service opens according to the old English Uses, formed a part of the Preparation of the Priest and his ministers before the beginning of Mass, and they were placed here in 1549 as a preparation for Priest and people alike. The rubric in the Scottish Liturgy reads: "*And the Presbyter, standing at the Holy Table, shall say the Lord's Prayer with the collect following for due preparation, the people kneeling.*" The 1928 Book says: "*The Priest standing at God's Board shall say the Lord's Prayer with the Collect following, the people kneeling.*"

The old rubric says that the Priest is to say these prayers "standing at the north side of the Table," a phrase inserted here in 1552, when the Table was brought at Communion time from its position at the east wall and set lengthwise at the lower end of the chancel, with the ends to the east and west. Thus the Priest, who had before been directed to stand "humbly afore the midst of the altar," to keep the same relative position to the Table, must stand at one side, which the rubric said should be the north side. When this custom of moving the Table was given up, in the reign of Charles I, the rubric lost its meaning, but it was not changed at the revision of 1662. The question then arose concerning the celebrant's position, since, as the Lambeth Judgment (1890) declared, the words "at the north side" were now "impossible of fulfilment in the sense originally intended." What is he to do?

He may (*a*) stand at the north end, which is at variance with all Church tradition and was never done in England before the seventeenth century; or (*b*) he may stand at the northern part of the front, which, as the aforesaid Lambeth Judgment says, "can only be regarded as an accommodation of the letter of the rubric to the present position of the Table," or (*c*) he can obey the rubric in its original sense (while disobeying the letter) by standing in the middle of the long side, which is now no longer the north but the west.

The first of these alternatives prevailed for many years to a large extent and was practised by men who would never be accused of Puritanism, like Bishop Cosin in the seventeenth century and Pusey and Newman in the nineteenth. The latter, it is said, celebrated at the north end until he severed his connection with the Church of England. This custom still survives in some churches. It appears from old engravings that both the eastward position and the north end position were common in England at the same time. An engraving in an edition (1720) of Wheatly's *Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer* shows the latter, and one in a 1672 edition of Bishop Sparrow's *Rationale* the former.

The rubric directs the Priest to begin the service by saying the Lord's Prayer with the Collect following.

These were originally part of the Priest's private preparation. The Lord's Prayer was not printed here until 1662, but it was directed to be said. It is an almost universal practice, though the rubric does not expressly sanction it, for the Priest to say the Lord's Prayer alone. This does not appear to have been the original intention and there is no indication of it in Wheatly's day. The fact that the Amen is printed in the same type as the prayer itself shows that it was not to be said as a response by the people, for in that case it would be in italics. Either all were to say it together, or the Priest was to say both the prayer and the Amen alone.

The Collect for Purity is of English origin and is at least as early as the Sacramentary of Alcuin (804). It prays for that purity of heart which is requisite for those who would see God and by which alone we can worthily magnify His holy Name and offer acceptable worship.

The Commandments which follow are a peculiarly Anglican feature and were introduced in 1552, with the purpose, apparently, of affording a standard for self-examination. Their form is that of the Great Bible (1539). The Alternative Order of the Communion in the 1928 Book gives a shortened form of the Commandments, and the same shortened form is permitted in the American and Scottish Books. Our Blessed Lord has taught us in the Sermon on the Mount that the Commandments are binding upon us in a different sense from that in which the Jews understood them, and the Christian interpretation of them is summed up in the Catechism in the duty towards God and towards our neighbours. When the Non-jurors drew up their Liturgy (1718) they substituted our Lord's Summary of the Law. This was placed after the Commandments in the Scottish Liturgy and afterwards in the American and the Canadian, to be used (with certain restrictions) as an alternative to the Commandments. The Scottish Book gives the further permission of substituting for the Ten Commandments or the Summary, on week-days (not being great festivals), the Lesser Litany, "Lord, have mercy upon us," etc., as before the principal Lord's Prayer in Mattins and Evensong. Or it may be said in addition. In the American Book the Summary is always said when the Commandments are are omitted. The English Revision permits the Lesser Litany to be sung or said (except on Sundays) either in English or in the Greek:

Kyrie, eleison,
Christe, eleison.
Kyrie, eleison.

Collect, Epistle and Gospel

The preparation ended, the Priest proceeds to say the Collects. Following the example of the Book of 1549, the English (1928), Scottish and American Liturgies insert here the Salutation, "The Lord be with you," etc. It was the opinion of St. Chrysostom (407) that the use of this salutation was Apostolic. Why it was left out in 1552 and subsequently it is difficult to say.

According to the 1662 Prayer Book, the Collect for the King is to be said first, and after that the Collect for the day. This is a reversal of the old order. The Collects for the King are modern, and were composed and introduced in this part of the service in 1549. The rubric ran: "*Then shall follow the Collect for the Day, with one of these two Collects following, for the King.*" This order continued until 1662. There is a petition for the King (as in most ancient liturgies) in the Prayer for the Church, which follows the Offertory, and the Bishops at the Lambeth Conference of 1897 were of opinion that permission might well be granted for the omission of the Collects for the King here. This is now done in the English (1928), Scottish and Irish Books. In the American Prayer Book there is nothing to correspond to our Collect for the King, but one of the Collects which come at the end of the English Communion Office, "O Almighty Lord," etc., is inserted to be said before the Collect for the day.

As the general character and the structure of the Collects have already been considered (p. 94), it is unnecessary to discuss the subject here, but it may be said that the greater part of those which the Prayer Book contains have been in use in the Church of England ever since the coming of Augustine (597), and many of them can be traced to the Sacramentaries of Leo (461) and Gelasius (496); quite a number, including those of the 1st and 2nd Sundays in Advent, Quinquagesima, 1st Sunday in Lent, 1st Sunday after Easter, the festivals of St. Andrew, St. Thomas, St. Mark, St. Philip and St. James were composed in 1549; those of the 3rd Sunday in Advent, the 6th Sunday after Epiphany and Easter Even in 1662; and in several cases important changes have been made in the ancient Collects. The Scottish, Irish and American Prayer Books have made provision for a second celebration of Holy Communion on Christmas Day by restoring the Collect which was provided to be said "at the first Communion" in the Book of 1549, with Epistle and Gospel. The Canadian Book gives the Collect only as "*An Additional Collect for Christmastide.*" Similarly for Easter Day the Scottish, American and Irish Books restore the ancient and beautiful Collect, "O God, who for our redemption didst give thine only begotten Son to the death of the Cross, and by his glorious resurrection hast delivered us from the power of our enemy; Grant us so to die daily from sin, that we may evermore live with him in the joy of his resurrection; through," etc., and provide an appropriate Epistle and Gospel. It is also given, without Epistle and Gospel, in the English Book of 1928.

All the revisions, except the Canadian, provide a special Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the days following the Circumcision up to Epiphany.

It will be noticed that there are three Collects provided for Good Friday. These are all that remain of the series of prayers in the old Sarum Office. The first Prayer Book directs that only the first of the three shall be said at Mattins and the other two "after the two Collects at the Communion," *i.e.* after the Collect for the King.

The Collect of the day does not always stand alone. The rubric directs that the Collect of the 1st Sunday in Advent (Advent Sunday) is to be said after the other Collects in Advent until Christmas Eve. On the three Holy-days immediately after Christmas the Collect of Christmas Day is to follow that for the day. The Ash Wednesday Collect is to be read every day in Lent after the Collect appointed for the day. Again, when a Holy-day takes precedence over a Sunday, the Collect of the Sunday follows the Collect of the day. But besides all these, " as occasion shall serve," any of the six Collects at the end of the Communion Service may be said here at the discretion of the Minister.

The reading of Holy Scripture has always been a feature of the Eucharistic Service. In the days of the Apostles, lections from the Old Testament—perhaps the prescribed Synagogue lessons from the Law and the Prophets—sufficed. Justin Martyr (150) speaks of the reading of the " Memoirs of the Apostles," which were almost certainly our Gospels. There is a table of Epistles and Gospels ascribed to St. Jerome (420) which is substantially the same as our own. This forms the basis of the series of Epistles and Gospels in the Sarum Missal, from which those in our Prayer Book are taken, with a few exceptions.

The great majority of the Epistles are taken from the writings of St. Paul, but " the Epistle " was the recognized liturgical term for the lection preceding the Gospel, even if it was taken from the Acts or the Revelation, or from the Old Testament. To satisfy the scruples of the Puritans at the Savoy Conference (1661) the title was changed when the lection was not taken from one of the Canonical Epistles to " *For the Epistle*," and in the rubric the reader was authorized to announce " The portion of Scripture appointed for the

Epistle," but in either case he was directed to say at the end "Here endeth the Epistle." In the English and Scottish Revisions "Lesson" is used for "Epistle" when the passage is not taken from an epistle.

In the early days the Epistle was read from an *ambo* (or pulpit) near the entrance to the chancel, that it might be heard distinctly by the people. Sometimes there were two ambones, one for the Epistle and another for the Gospel. The Prayer Book gives no direction as to where the Epistle is to be read, or how the reader is to turn himself, so we are left to tradition and to our common sense. The first Prayer Book said it was to be read "in a place assigned for the purpose." The place varied according to the size of the church, but it was generally on the south side of the chancel or sanctuary, the Gospel being read from the north side. This is a matter of no great significance, but it is convenient, and if it is recognized, where there are several ministers each can take his own place without confusion. Some read the Epistle without turning to the people. This was an old Sarum custom when the Mass was said in Latin and the people could not understand it, but it has no justification now when the service is in English. The Epistle and Gospel are for the edification of the people, and the principle laid down by the Bishops at the Savoy Conference is a sound one, that the Minister should turn to the people "when he speaks to them, as in Lessons, Absolution and Benedictions," and "when he speaks for them to God, it is fit that they should turn another way as the ancient Church ever did." The 1928 Book has a rubric: "He that readeth the Epistle or the Gospel shall so stand and turn himself as he may best be heard of the people."

The omission of any direction concerning the posture of the congregation during the reading of the Epistle is another instance of the fact that the rubrics are not a complete directory. The people kneel for the Collect, but it was certainly not intended that they should continue kneeling while the Epistle is read, and the custom of doing so in some churches is only a recent one borrowed from the Roman Church. Kneeling is an attitude of worship, but the reading of the Epistle is not an act of worship; it is for the instruction of the people, and the ancient custom was for the people to sit. An old Statute of Lincoln Cathedral (1236) says: "The people sit while Lessons and Epistles are read." Dr. Nicholls (1712) says: "It has been an ancient custom for the congregation to sit to repose themselves during the reading of the Epistle," and Bishop Frere, commenting on the direction to stand for the Gospel, says that to kneel for the Epistle "is subversive of the whole purpose of the rubric; for instead of marking the Gospel with special reverence it assigns it to a less reverent posture."

As far back as the days of St. Augustine (430) it was customary to sing a Psalm after the Epistle. This gave place to a verse of a Psalm sung with an antiphon followed by Alleluia. This was called the *Gradual.* Later there was added a metrical hymn, called the *Sequence*, and some of our well-known hymns, such as "Come, thou Holy Spirit, come," "At the Cross her station keeping," "Day of wrath, O day of mourning," are translations of these. No rubrical authority can be cited for the introduction of any hymn in this service; but if popular demand is held to justify their use, a hymn between the Epistle and Gospel, representing the usage of many centuries, will be recognized as fitting. Luther, in a service book which he issued in 1523, gave direction for the choir to sing a German hymn between the Epistle and the Gospel.

From very early times special honour was paid to the reading of the Gospel. In *The Pilgrimage of Etheria*, an interesting book discovered a few years ago, describing the visit of a lady of Aquitania to the Holy Land in the fourth century, we are told that incense was burned in the deacon's procession as he went to the ambo to read the Gospel, and St. Jerome (420) tell us that candles were lighted. The book of Gospels was and still is in the East richly bound and ornamented, and the bringing in of this book just before the reading of the Gospel, called the Lesser Entrance, is one of the chief ceremonies of the Liturgy. The place for reading the Gospel was usually higher than that for the Epistle. "In St. Augustine's time," says Wheatly, "the people always stood when the Lessons were read, to show their reverence to God's Holy Word; but afterwards, when this was thought too great a burden, they were allowed to sit down at the Lessons and were only obliged to *stand* at the reading of the Gospel." The custom of singing or saying "Glory be to Thee, O Lord," is a very old one and was enjoined in the first Prayer Book, but, although it has had no rubrical authority since 1552, it seems to have survived everywhere, and it is now prescribed in recent revisions. The Scottish, Irish and

Canadian Books also insert “ Thanks be to Thee, O Lord,” or equivalent words, to be said after the Gospel. This has no English precedent. In the Alternative Rite of the 1928 Book the form is “ Praise be to thee, O Christ.” In the Mozarabic Liturgy, an ancient rite still retained in the Cathedral of Toledo, there is simply the response “ Amen.”

CHAPTER VII

OF THE HOLY COMMUNION (ii)

The Creed and Sermon

AFTER the Gospel follows the Nicene Creed. A brief sketch of the history and use of this Creed has already been given (p. 85), and it need not be repeated here. The Creed is not an essential feature of the Eucharistic Service and the Alternative Liturgy of the 1928 Book says that " at the discretion of the Minister it may be omitted on any day not being a Sunday or a Holy-day." It was first incorporated in the Liturgy at Antioch in the fifth century as a safeguard against Arianism. More than a century later it was introduced into the Western Service books in Spain and then in Rome. It may be noted that the rubric says, " shall be sung or said," giving the preference to the musical rendering, which is fitting if it is regarded as an act of worship.

The custom of pausing after the Creed to make public announcements is an old one, dating as far back as the fourteenth century in the English Church, and earlier in other parts. The fact that provision is made for public notices in this service only is an evidence that the Holy Communion was regarded as the principal service, at which most of the people would be gathered together. The "Curate" mentioned as the one who is to make the announcements is not of necessity the celebrant, but the incumbent of the church, who has the cure of souls. In its original form (1552) the rubric was simply to "declare unto the people whether there be any holy-days or fasting days during the week following." This he was to do after the sermon, but in 1662 the rubric was changed to require the notice to be given after the Creed. These holy-days and fasting days are, of course, to be found at the beginning of the Prayer Book; but the Parish Priest is to remind his parishioners of them that they may be observed. The notice of Services is quite another thing. The "Briefs, Citations and Excommunications" are somewhat out of date. The first meant letters from the Sovereign directing special collections for church building or other purposes, which are never issued now; the second meant notices to appear before the ecclesiastical court to perform certain duties; and the third was a notification to the congregation when any sentence of excommunication had been canonically imposed. The Canadian Prayer Book restores the direction for the publication of Banns of Marriage (omitted from the English Book without authority), retains Excommunication, and adds "*other ecclesiastical notices.*" The American Book simply inserts after Banns of Matrimony "*other matters to be published.*" The Scottish Liturgy has "*and, subject to the authority of the Bishop, other notices may be read.*"

"*Then shall follow the Sermon,*" the rubric says. There is more liberty in the Scottish rubric, which says, "*if there be a Sermon, it followeth here.*" The Irish Book has, "*Here followeth the Sermon*"; the 1928

English Rite, "*Then may follow the Sermon.*" The neglect of preaching in England in pre-Reformation days was very great, and there can be no question that the framers of our Prayer Book set themselves to correct this by the provision of a minimum of one sermon a week at the Sunday morning service, when either the Holy Communion was celebrated, or at least the Ante-Communion service was said. "At the time of the Reformation," says a writer in the *Prayer Book Dictionary*, "it was felt that the people much needed instruction, and that the clergy as a body were unable to give it. Many were illiterate, and some ill affected to what was called the new learning. In many parishes the incumbent was not licensed to preach." It was under these conditions that the Homilies were issued, to be read instead of the sermons. These, although they contain much excellent matter, are not publicly read at the present day, but bishops, for the most part, give licence to the clergy from their ordination as deacons to preach their own sermons.

Although the sermon was in very early times a recognized feature in the service, preaching was by no means universal. Some writers tell us that in the early centuries only the bishops preached, but this statement must be qualified. It would be more correct to say that the responsibility of instructing the people was recognized as pertaining to the episcopal office, and that for this reason the bishops preached regularly, but when they had under them presbyters and deacons who were apt to teach, the bishops commissioned them to do so. Origen, the great scholar of Alexandria (253), was invited to preach by the Bishops of Cæsarea and Jerusalem when he was a layman. St. Athanasius was the spokesman for his bishop Alexander at the Council of Nicæa while he was a deacon, and it is safe to assume that he was accustomed to preach. St. Augustine (430) and his contemporary, St. Chrysostom, were noted preachers before they became bishops, and it was because Arius was a popular preacher at Alexandria that his heresy spread as it did. In the Middle Ages learning declined and preaching fell largely into disuse. In England some of the bishops gave to their clergy brief discourses on the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments to read to their people, and these were all the sermons they had.

The reason why the sermon comes at this part of the service appears to be that its chief use was to explain the Epistle and Gospel. This is very noticeable in the sermons of St. Augustine. Sometimes sermons ran to considerable length, but St. Cyril of Jerusalem recommends that they should not last more than an hour.

There is no prescribed form in the Prayer Book for introducing the sermon. The 55th Canon (1604) provides a Bidding Prayer " to be used by all preachers before their sermons," but Bishop Barry very fitly says of this : " As it simply covers the ground which is elsewhere covered (in the Church Militant prayer and other parts of the service), it seems likely that it was intended to be used only when sermons were preached without the regular service." This is the way it is used at University sermons at Oxford and Cambridge and elsewhere. The ancient custom was to preface the sermon with the mutual salutation, the preacher saying "Peace be with you," and the people responding "And with thy spirit." From the days of St. Chrysostom at least it has been the practice to end the sermon with the ascription of praise.

The Offertory

The term "Offertory" is used of the anthem sung while the offerings are made, but it means properly the part of the service in which the offering takes place, as is evidenced by the last rubric at the end of the Communion Service, which speaks of "the money given at the offertory." There are a number of sentences here taken from Holy Scripture (two of them being from the Book of Tobit) dealing for the most part with almsgiving. The American, Canadian, and Revised English Rites have some additional sentences, and in the Scottish Liturgy the selection is quite different, some of them being particularly appropriate to the Eucharistic oblation, as "I will offer in his dwelling an oblation with great gladness," etc.; "Offer unto God thanksgiving," etc.; "I will offer to thee the sacrifice of thanksgiving," etc. The Prayer Book of 1549 prescribed that "*Where there be clerks* [*choristers*], *they shall sing one or many of the sentences above written, according to the length and shortness of the time that the people be offering.*" John Marbecke set the sentences to suitable music. The present rubric directs the Priest to "say" one or more of the sentences, but it is pointed out in the *Prayer Book Dictionary* that "this direction is by custom read as a minimum and not as excluding the singing of one or more sentences." A rubric in the Coronation Service says: "*Then shall the organ play and the choir sing the offertory.*" The singing of a hymn here is quite permissible. It will be noticed that it is the "Priest" after his return to the Lord's Table—he has either been in the pulpit or occupying a seat in the chancel during the sermon—who is to say the sentence, and the practice which obtains in some churches of saying it from the pulpit or elsewhere, as a preliminary to pronouncing the hymn, is quite irregular. Then, too, the offertory is part of the Communion Service, and there is no authority for saying one of these sentences at Mattins or Evensong except that the American Book inserts a Note: "These Sentences may be used on any other occasion of Public Worship when the Offerings of the People are to be received." To the minds of some people the proclamation "Let your light so shine," etc., is equivalent to the statement that a collection will now be made. It is also incorrect to say: "The Offertory will be for such and such a purpose," as if the word meant money contributed. "The fashion of calling the collection *the Offertory*," says Mr. Tyrer, "has no sanction whatever in the Prayer Book, or in any other liturgical authority, and is merely a vulgar error of the last half-century."

The first of the two rubrics following the sentences deals with the collection and presentation of the alms. The "bason" containing them is to be humbly presented by the Priest and placed upon the holy Table. Nothing is directed to be said or sung here.

The offering is made in the prayer that follows. "It is a false analogy," says Dr. Frere, "which leads the Celebrant in the English rite to make a ceremonious offering of the alms and oblations . . . before he begins the prayer for the Church Militant, instead of doing as the rite provides." He adds: "It is more mistaken still to have the alms removed from the altar before that prayer."

The rubric following directs that after receiving the alms the Priest shall place the Bread and Wine upon the Table. Here no ceremony is indicated. "A variety of ceremonial," Canon Warren points out, "is found in the older Liturgies accompanying the offering of the elements and various separate forms of prayer of oblation." In the Eastern Church the elements are brought by the Priest and his attendants from the side chapel, in solemn procession, with lights and incense. This is called the "Greater Entrance" and is the chief ceremony of the Greek Liturgy. In the Scottish Liturgy the sentence from 1 Chron. xxix. is introduced: "Blessed be thou, O Lord God, for ever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness. . . ." This—beginning "Thine, O Lord"—is one of the sentences of the Offertory in the American Book. The Coronation Service has here the prayer: "Bless, O Lord, we beseech thee, these thy gifts, and sanctify them unto this holy use, that by them we may be made partakers of the Body and Blood of thine only begotten Son Jesus Christ, and fed unto everlasting life of soul and body."

The direction that the Bread and Wine are at this time to be placed upon the Table indicates that they were not there at the beginning of the service. Indeed there is nothing to show that the chalice and paten are to be placed upon the altar before the Offertory, though this is customary now. It is implied that there is a Credence Table, or some kind of a shelf or cupboard near at hand, where the elements are kept until the time of offering. Otherwise they must be brought in then from the sacristy or vestry. There is some precedent for this. Dr. T. I. Ball says: "At high services in large churches where there were many clerks the things required were often conveyed at the appropriate time from the vestry to the altar, sometimes with considerable ceremony; a Credence Table was then superfluous." He also points out that the use of the Credence (which is generally placed against the south wall of the sanctuary) is purely utilitarian, and that it is doubtful whether in mediæval times our churches were generally provided with them, a "niche, a shelf, or the sill of a window serving often for this purpose at plain services."

The words of the above-mentioned writer concerning the elements of Bread and Wine are worthy of quotation. "Why such materials were ordered to be used rather than any other is no affair of ours. . . . To tamper with the elements of a Sacrament ordained by Christ is to adulterate a divine ordinance, and to invent a new Sacrament to which no promise of grace belongs. . . . In instituting the Eucharist our Lord used (*a*) Wheaten Bread; (*b*) Wine of the Grape. About this there is not, nor has there ever been, any serious doubt in the Christian Church." On the question whether the bread should be leavened or unleavened there has been much controversy, the Eastern Churches standing for the former and the Latin Church for the latter, but it is generally agreed that as far as the validity of the Sacrament is concerned it is immaterial. There has been a good deal of discussion also as to whether loaf-bread or wafer-bread should be used. The symbol of unity, in all being partakers of one loaf, tells in favour of the former, while convenience and the avoidance of crumbs recommend the latter. The use of wafer-bread was universal in England before the Prayer Book was drawn up, and it was continued under the first Prayer Book; but in the revision of 1552, "to take away the superstition which any person hath, or might have," permission was given to use ordinary bread, "but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten," and this permission still survives. Wheatly quotes Bishop Cosin (1672), one of the revisers, as saying: "It is not here commanded that no unleavened or wafer-bread be used; but it is only said that the other bread *shall suffice*, so that there was no necessity, yet there was a liberty still reserved of using wafer-bread, which was used in divers Churches of the Kingdom, and Westminster for one, till the 17th of King Charles." This agrees with Archbishop Parker's (1575) assertion that the rubric was never intended to do away with the use of wafer-bread. The same phrase "*it shall suffice*" occurs in the rubric in the Baptismal Office giving permission to pour water upon the child. A rubric in the English 1928 Book says: "It is desirable that the Bread shall be the best and purest wheat bread, whether loaf or wafer, that conveniently may be gotten."

With regard to the other element, the question has arisen in modern times whether unfermented grape-juice may be lawfully used. It is sufficient, perhaps, on this point to quote the Resolution passed by the Lambeth Conference in 1888: "The use of unfermented juice of the grape, or any liquid other than true wine diluted or undiluted, as the element in administration of the cup in Holy Communion, is unwarranted by the example of our Lord, and is an unauthorized departure from the custom of the Catholic Church." The words "diluted or undiluted" bring up the matter of the mixed chalice, which means the adding of a little water to the wine, a practice which some have deemed unlawful because it is not directed in our present rubric, as it was in the Prayer Book of 1549. "How it came to be neglected in the review of our Liturgy in King Edward's reign," says Wheatly, "I have never been able to discover. I am apt to suspect that it was thrown out upon some objection of Calvin or Bucer, who were no friends of any practice for ancient or Catholic, if it did not happen to suit their fancy or humour." That the practice continued is shown by the fact that it was observed in the King's Chapel all the while that Bishop Andrewes (1626) was Dean, and his form for the *Consecration of Churches* directs it. In the Episcopal Church of Scotland, says Bishop Dowden, it has always been customary. Mr. Eeles, in his *Traditional Ceremonies of the Scottish Church*, quotes the Rev. Robert

Adams as saying (1809): "Every branch of the Christian Church, the Armenians excepted, administered the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ in a mixed cup of wine and water until the Reformation, when Luther first departed from this primitive practice and was followed by the Reformers at Geneva. The mixture is accordingly practised in this Church, though not enjoined in her Communion office." Strangely enough, it is forbidden by a Canon of the Irish Church. No one ventures to question the antiquity of the practice. Dr. John Lightfoot, the foremost Hebrew scholar of his time (1675) maintained that, according to Jewish custom, our Lord would have used a cup of mingled wine and water at the institution of the Sacrament. Dr. Edersheim in our time substantiates this opinion. Justin Martyr (150) tells us that the mixed chalice was used at the Eucharist in the middle of the second century, and there is continuous evidence for it from the fathers and the Liturgies from that time. The legality of the mixed chalice (as far as England is concerned) was affirmed by Archbishop Benson in his Lincoln Judgment (1890) as long as it did not involve any additional ceremony, and this decision was confirmed by the Privy Council, reversing a former judgment. In the Eastern Church there are special ceremonies connected with the preparation of the chalice, which is a part of the office of *prothesis*, and takes place in the side chapel just before the Greater Entrance. A rubric in the English Book (1928) says: "It is an ancient tradition of the Church to mingle a little water with the wine."

The Close of the First Part of the Service

"The ceremony of the *Lavabo*, that is, the washing of the celebrant's fingers after the placing of the elements on the Holy Table and before the prayer for the Church Militant," was noted by the *Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline* (1906) as widely prevalent, though without any recognition in the Prayer Book. It recalls the symbolism of Psalm xxiv: "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall rise up in his holy place? Even he that hath clean hands and a pure heart." It was in use in the second year of Edward VI and was practised in the seventeenth century by Bishop Andrewes and others. The Report of the Commission says: "In the third century there are traces of washing the hands as a preparation for prayer on the part of all Christians; and from the fourth century onwards it appears to have been usual for the ministers at the Communion Service ceremonially to wash their hands before the more solemn part of the service as a symbol of inward purity. The name 'Lavabo' is derived from (the Latin of) words of the 26th Psalm, which the celebrant was directed to recite during the ceremony: 'I will wash my hands in innocency, O Lord, and so will I go to thine altar.'" The Commission classes this ceremony among "the various irregularities having significance," but makes no objection to it.

The Priest then invites the whole congregation to "pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth,"[1] and then he proceeds to offer the prayer in their name. No direction is given as to his attitude when he gives this invitation, but, on the general principle laid down by the Bishops at the Savoy Conference, that when the clergy address the people they are to turn towards the people, the Priest does so here.

The Ante-Communion service ended with the Offertory in the first Prayer Book, but in the rearrangement of the service in 1552 it was made to take in the Prayer for the Church, which in the Book of 1549 did not come here but was a part of the Canon. According to the American Prayer Book it ends with the Gospel—"*all that is appointed at the Communion, unto the end of the Gospel, concluding with the Blessing*," which is rather an abrupt ending. In all the early Liturgies the Great Intercession was a conspicuous feature, but it was generally in close connection with the Prayer of Consecration. In most of the Eastern Liturgies it came after the Consecration. In the Roman Mass the prayers for the living precede the commemoration of the Institution, and those for the departed followed it, and in the Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies the Intercession occurs where it is in the English rite. Bishop Frere says that the placing of the Intercession here in the revision of 1552 "was consciously or unconsciously a return to primitive use." The addition to the form of bidding of the words "militant here in earth" was made in 1552 to satisfy Bucer. To Bucer was also due the omission of the commemoration of the departed. "The foreign reformers," says Luckock, "who removed the prayer for the dead, never ventured to deny that it was lawful or primitive. Their arguments and action were founded on expediency alone, and, as so often happens, it betrayed them into extreme measures where modification would have sufficed."

---

[1] The last four words are omitted in the 1928 Liturgy; also in the Scottish and American Liturgies.

The concluding sentence, "And we also bless thy holy Name," etc., added in 1662, makes the prayer much more complete than it was left in 1552. The whole prayer for the Church in the 1928 Book, under the heading "The Intercession," is greatly enriched. Before the petition for the King is one "to lead all nations in the way of righteousness and peace." After the prayer for the clergy (with special mention of the Bishop of the Diocese) is the section: "Guide and prosper, we pray thee, those who are labouring for the spread of thy Gospel among the nations, and enlighten with thy Spirit all places of education and learning; that the whole world may be filled with the knowledge of thy truth." Then for the departed: "We commend to thy gracious keeping, O Lord, all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, beseeching thee to grant them everlasting light and peace." In the South African Rite there is a similar enrichment of this prayer. It prays for "all Kings, Presidents and Rulers" and, after the King, for "his Ministers and Parliaments, and all set in authority throughout his Dominions." There is a petition too for "all men in their several callings, that they seek the common welfare, and promote goodwill and brotherhood on earth." The commemoration of the saints is taken partly from the Book of 1549 and partly from the 1928 Revision.

The words "*and oblations*," inserted after "*alms*" in 1662, are directly connected with the Offertory, but their meaning is somewhat doubtful. Bishop Barry says: "Some refer them to the 'other devotions of the people,' which are called 'Oblations' in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637; others to the bread and wine just solemnly placed on the Holy Table. The latter is more probable, considering the ancient precedents and the history of the insertion of these words; but it is possible they were intended to include both."

There is no direction in the Prayer Book, as there used to be in olden times, that the unbaptized and excommunicate should go out after this prayer when there is a Communion: so the inference seems to be that (contrary to the ancient sense of propriety) they are permitted to remain for the service of the Faithful. A pause here is quite in accordance with custom, but is unauthorized by any rubric or Canon.

Directions for ending the service here when there is no Communion are given in the Prayer Book of 1662 at the end of the Office, where six Collects are provided, three of which are ancient and three dating from 1549. After these is the rubric "*Upon Sundays*," etc. Instead of "*one or more of these Collects*," the 1928 Book says: "*one or more Collects contained in this Book or sanctioned by the Bishop*."

The using of the Ante-Communion service is not, as some seem to think, an undesirable practice introduced at the time of the Reformation, but its use as a Sunday service to the discouragement of frequent communion certainly was. There was, however, as Dr. Frere points out, "an old custom, current in primitive times, of saying the introductory part of the Liturgy on solemn days when there was no celebration of the whole." Similarly, Dr. Wickham Legg declares "Table Prayers" to be one of the most ancient and Catholic practices known to the Church, which can be traced as far as anything liturgical can be traced.

CHAPTER VIII

OF THE HOLY COMMUNION (iii)

The Preparation of the Communicants

WHEN the Ante-Communion Service is ended we do not (except in the Scottish Liturgy) enter immediately upon the Eucharistic Service proper, but there is a further preparation for those who are about to communicate. The two long Exhortations, which are seldom used now, were needed when the Prayer Book was first drawn up, for Communion was very much neglected, attendance at Mass being thought sufficient, with Communion perhaps once a year. "The ancient Church," says Wheatly, "indeed had no such Exhortations; for the daily, or at least weekly communions made it known that there was then no solemn assembly without it and everyone (not under censure) was expected to communicate." With this he compares the infrequency of communion in his own day and shows the propriety of these Exhortations. Happily for us, frequent communions have now, to a great extent, been restored and the Exhortations are less frequently used. The English rubric says: "*When the Minister giveth warning for the Celebration . . . he shall read this Exhortation following.*" The Canadian Book for "*shall*" reads "*may*" and the Scottish, American, and English (1928) Books place the Exhortations at the end of the service.

This Exhortation, the Invitation, Confession, Absolution and Comfortable Words are taken from *The Order of the Communion* of 1548, where they were added to the Latin service, after the Prayer of Consecration and the Priest's Communion. These, says Canon Warren, "are a beautiful characteristic and distinguishing feature of the present Anglican Liturgy. They form a public and corporate preparation for communion on the part of the people." In the old Latin service there was the mutual and private confession and absolution of the celebrant and the assistant Ministers, or Servers, said at the commencement of the service on the altar steps, and when there were any communicants a short public confession was said in their name. The abolition of the mediæval rule of compulsory private confession made it desirable to give a more congregational character to this act of penitence.

The requirements of those who partake at the Lord's Table are the same as are expressed in the last answer of the Catechism: true repentance of sins, steadfast purpose to lead a new life, faith and charity. The outward expression of brotherly love and charity in early days was the Kiss of Peace (p. 10), which was given at the beginning of the Service of the Faithful, after the others had departed. This custom was discontinued to avoid scandal, and in its place there was in use in England in mediæval times a "pax-board" or small tablet of wood or metal, which was kissed by the Priest and then passed around for the communicants to kiss. The symbol was given up, but in place there was inserted the reminder of the love as brethren which ought to prevail amongst partakers at the same Table. The words "Draw near" were probably at first meant as an invitation to communicants to come to the front, or into the choir.

The first of the long Exhortations deals with the particular confession of sins by those who feel the need of it, inviting anyone who cannot quiet his conscience to come and open his grief, that he "may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice." In the First Prayer Book there is added: "Requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession, not to be offended with those that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the Priest; nor those also which think needful or convenient for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the Priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God, and the general confession to the Church; but in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity."

The Absolution is a translation of the old Latin with an additional clause, prefixed in 1548. Its form is not declaratory, as at Mattins, but, as Bishop Jeremy Taylor expresses it, "optative and by way of intercession." Bishop Barry's term "benedictory" is a good one. The direction that it is to be pronounced by the Bishop, if present, was borrowed in 1662 from the Scottish Liturgy of 1637.

The idea of the Comfortable Words is taken from the Lutheran Archbishop Hermann's *Consultation* (1543), where they came before the Absolution. They are the

Scriptural grounds upon which the Absolution rests and are, as Wheatly says, " so overflowing with sweet and powerful comforts that if only considered they will satisfy the most fearful souls, heal the most broken hearts, and utterly banish the blackest clouds of sorrow and despair."

The Great Thanksgiving

"The next portion of the Service," says Bishop Barry, " which is the great offering of Thanksgiving, is in the substance of immemorial antiquity; and it is notable that we pass to it from what is comparatively modern without the slightest sense of break or jar of tone." It is generally opened (as in the Prayer Book of 1549, the Scottish Liturgy and the English Revision) with the mutual salutation " The Lord be with you," etc., and then comes the *Sursum Corda*, "Lift up your hearts," etc., with the following " Let us give thanks," etc., which are found with slight variations in every Liturgy from the earliest times. This feature may reasonably be supposed to come from Apostolic days, for, as Luckock says, " its existence in every primitive Liturgy, Oriental and Western, can best be explained by assigning it a place in the primal nucleus of the Eucharistic Service." It is the beginning of the act of Thanksgiving which gives to the service the name " Eucharist." It is a notable fact, not easy to explain, that the element of thanksgiving occupied a much larger place in the ancient Liturgies than it does in our own.

The Preface is the name commonly given to the part that follows, because it is a prelude to the most solemn part of the service. Its opening words take up the people's response just uttered, "It is meet and right so to do," which was the invariable custom. We acknowledge here the duty of giving thanks to God, but do not recall, as the old Liturgies did (p. 10), the things for which our thanks are due. Here is an extract from the Preface in the Liturgy of St. Basil: "Thou didst call us into being from out of nothing, and when we fell didst raise us again, and ceasest not to act in our behalf until Thou broughtest us up to heaven, and gavest us Thy Kingdom in the life to come. For all these things we render thanks to Thee and to Thine only begotten Son and to Thy Holy Spirit; for all Thy bounties known and unknown, manifest and hidden." The omission in our Service is partly supplied by the Proper Prefaces, which emphasize special blessings for which our thanks are due: the Incarnation, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the coming of the Holy Ghost, the revelation of the Blessed Trinity. In the Eastern Liturgies, where the Preface is so full, there are no Proper Prefaces, but in the old Western forms there were very many. These were much reduced in the time of Gregory the Great (598), and in the Sarum Use there were ten. These were further reduced by Cranmer to five, of which two are translations from the Sarum and three were composed in 1549.[1]

---

[1] The Scottish Book has Additional Prefaces for Advent, Epiphany, the Purification, the Annunciation, Lent, Passion Tide, Maundy Thursday, the Transfiguration, Feasts of Apostles and Evangelists, All Saints, Consecration of Bishops, and Ordination of Priests and Deacons and Dedication of Churches. The Canadian Book adds one for Epiphany and its octave. The American Book has a common Preface for the Annunciation,

After the Preface follows the Triumphal Hymn, commonly called the Sanctus or Tersanctus, "Holy, Holy, Holy," etc., the hymn of the seraphim in Isaiah vi. 3. Like the *Sursum Corda*, it is found in all Liturgies, and it has been used in the worship of the Jews from time immemorial. In most early Liturgies it concluded with the words: "Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the Highest." It had this ending (in a slightly altered form) in the first Prayer Book, but the latter part was struck out in 1552. The English 1928 and Scottish Rites permit the restoration of these words. "In this hymn," says Bishop Sparrow, "we hold communion with the Church triumphant," and Wheatly: "That the angels were present at the performance of the divine mysteries hath been the opinion of both heathen and Christians, and that they are especially present at the Lord's Supper is generally received: for since Jesus by His death hath united heaven and earth, it is fit that in the commemoration of His passion we should begin to unite our voices with the heavenly choir, with whom we hope to praise Him to all eternity."

The Consecration and Communion

The prayer immediately preceding the Consecration is commonly called the "Prayer of Humble Access,"

Purification and Transfiguration, and Prefaces for Epiphany and All Saints. The English 1928 Rite adds Prefaces for Epiphany, Maundy Thursday, the Purification, Annunciation, the Transfiguration, Saints Days, Consecration or Dedication Festival of a Church, and a Common one for any Sunday. The South African Rite also has a Common for any Sunday, but different from the English one.

a title which comes from the Scottish Liturgy of 1637. Wheatly calls it the "Address." It was composed for the Order of Communion of 1548, where it came, very fitly, after the Consecration and just before the reception, as it still does in Scotland, and in the American Book. The *Prayer Book Interleaved* notes that "the part intervening between the Tersanctus and the prayer of Consecration varied in early times," and it quotes a prayer from the Liturgy of St. Basil as similar to our own. The idea of the prayer quoted, however, is not so much the unworthiness of the people to receive as that of the Priest to celebrate: "We thy sinful and unworthy servants, who have been permitted to minister at thy holy Altar, not for our own righteousness . . . but for thy mercies and compassions . . . draw nigh." Dr. Keating says in the *Prayer Book Dictionary*: "The abrupt transition from the exaltation of the Tersanctus is remarkable, and also peculiar to the English rite. But the sudden sense of unworthiness to draw near is natural even in the midst of the previous act of Praise."

The next step is the consecration of the elements of bread and wine by the Word of God and prayer. "The Consecration Prayer," Canon Warren says, "is the central and essential prayer of the service, to which everything which has gone before leads up, as it were to a climax." The Consecration takes place, not, as in the Eastern Church, with gates closed and the veil drawn so that the Priest cannot be seen, but "before the people." The Priest is not acting for himself alone. He speaks and acts for the congregation, as the organ of the Body, and his position "standing before the

Table" has (as Bishop Barry points out) appropriateness, as placing the Priest at the head of the people." [1]

The prayer consists of three parts: (1) the recital of the work of redemption by the one Sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the whole world; (2) the petition "Hear us," etc., which corresponds to the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, and (3) the recital of the "words of the Institution."

The first part lays such stress upon the sufficiency of Christ's Sacrifice—"didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world"—and states so clearly the purpose of the holy Sacrament—"did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again"—that it is difficult to see how there is room for anyone to pervert the Church's teaching regarding the Eucharist by saying that it implies that the sacrifice of the Cross was not enough. Every time the Holy Communion is celebrated the perfection of that Sacrifice is proclaimed. It is, as the Catechism says, "the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ." Dean Brevint wrote (1673): "This Sacrifice, which by a real oblation was not to be offered more than once, is by an eucharistical and devout commemoration to be offered up every day. This is what the Apostle calls 'to set forth the death of the Lord'; so to set it forth, I say, as well before the eyes of God, his Father, as before the eyes of men; and which St. Austin did explain when he said that the holy Flesh of Jesus Christ was offered up in three manners: by prefiguring sacrifices under the Law, before his coming into the world; in real deed upon the Cross; and by a commemorative Sacrifice, after he had ascended into heaven." See too how the completeness of the Sacrifice is set forth in Canon Bright's beautiful Communion Hymn:

---

[1] The Irish Book is unique in directing that the Priest shall say the prayer "standing at the north side of the Table."

> "And now, O Father, mindful of the love
>   That bought us, once for all, on Calvary's tree;
> And having with us Him that pleads above,
>   We here present, we here spread forth to Thee
> That only offering perfect in Thine eyes,
> The one, true, pure, immortal sacrifice."

The second part, from "Hear us" to "Body and Blood," is similar to the corresponding section of the Roman rite, though it was not so in the first Prayer Book. In that Cranmer introduced a feature which is found in all Eastern Liturgies, the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, commonly called by the Greek name the *Epiclesis :* "with thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts of Bread and Wine that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ." These words were objected to by the German Bucer, who was then in England, and were omitted in 1552. They were, however (in a slightly altered form), inserted in the Scottish Liturgy, and from that passed on to the American Prayer Book, where they are placed after, instead of before, the Words of Institution, as in the English 1928 and the Scottish 1929 Liturgies. It may be said that in the English Book they are implied, though not expressed. To quote the words of Dean Luckock, " We pray that those who receive the consecrated bread and wine may be partakers of Christ's Body and Blood; we may make no mention of the means by which the result is obtained, knowing well that God will accomplish it in his own appointed way, namely, by the agency of the Holy Spirit."

The " Words of Institution," as they are commonly called, are really the words of administration, used by our Blessed Lord after He had given thanks and blessed the bread and the cup. They are a part of every known Liturgy, and from this fact the theory arose that in these words the act of consecration was centred. This theory was adopted by the Roman Church at the Synod of Rome (1079), and was taught in the Catechism of the Council of Trent (1568). The Eastern Church, on the other hand, has always held that the consecration is affected through the Invocation, or Prayer of Blessing. As Bishop Frere says, " The centre of gravity of the action became in the West the Words of Institution, and in the East the Epiclesis or Invocation," and he points out that the English prayer is carefully worded so as not to express any special theory of consecration while consecrating the sacrament." Strangely enough, the prevailing Protestant theory on this point coincides with the Roman, though the Presbyterian divines would have had the Epiclesis restored in the Prayer Book of 1662. The Rev. J. W. Tyrer, in a discriminating article in *The Prayer Book Dictionary*, says: " The Reformers had been brought up in Scholastic modes of thought.

And, however much they came to differ from the Church of Rome in other respects, they continued to hold that the Words of Institution were the form of Eucharistic Consecration. This is still the belief of the Lutheran and with one exception (the Established Church of Scotland) of the Calvinistic bodies." This theory is certainly implied in the rubric of 1662 providing for a second consecration if required; but the Scottish and American Rites direct the Priest in such a case to use the whole Consecration Prayer. The English 1928 Rite directs the use of the Words of Institution followed by the Invocation.

Note that our Lord's words, as quoted in all Liturgies, include the direction given by St. Paul and St. Luke, " Do this in remembrance—for a memorial—of me," to which St. Paul adds (1 Cor. xi. 26): "For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." The Eucharist is not to put men in remembrance of Christ's death. This could be done more simply by a picture, or by reading the story of the Passion. The language used seems to point to the Levitical worship in which the offerings were to be " for a memorial before your God " (Numb. x. 10), putting God in remembrance (as it were) of His promised Loving Kindness and mercy. This memorial, or *anamnesis*, as the Greeks called it, was a marked feature in every Liturgy. In the Liturgy of St. James, *e.g.*, the priest says: "As oft as ye eat" etc. . . . " ye shew forth the Lord's death and confess his resurrection," and the people respond: " We shew forth thy death, O Lord, and confess Thy Resurrection." In the first Prayer Book of Edward VI there is the clause: "We thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make," and this is followed in the Scottish, the American and the 1928 English Rites. The South African has: "We offer here unto thy divine majesty this holy Bread of eternal life and this Cup of everlasting salvation," and there follows immediately the prayer for the Holy Spirit. Here too the Lord's Prayer comes at the end of the Consecration, and the Prayer of Humble Access just before the Communion.

The solemn breaking of the bread, recalling St. Paul's account of the institution—"which was broken for you" (1 Cor. xi. 24)—was a general custom, though only in the Anglican Rite does it take place at the time of the consecration.

The rubric concerning the delivery of the Sacrament to the people directs the Priest to deliver it "into their hands." The former custom was to place the consecrated wafer in the mouth of the communicant. The Minister may, if he thinks it necessary for safety, retain his hold upon the cup, while the communicant uses his hands for the purpose of guiding it. Nevertheless, it is obligatory on the communicant to use his hands in some manner, unless really disabled from doing so.

It is another instance of the insufficiency of the rubrics that nothing is said about where the laity are to receive. They are to kneel; but where? In the Eastern Church the Priest comes down to the body of the Church to communicate the people there. The altar-rails, now so common in churches, were unknown before the seventeenth century. They were ordered by Archbishop Laud in 1636 to protect the altar from profanation. Before that time kneeling benches for the communicants were common.

The long forms of Administration, which combine those of 1549 and 1552, are peculiar to the English Rite. The earlier form followed ancient models, while the latter—" Take and eat," etc., " Drink this," etc.—was new at the time. In the third century the form was " This is the Body of Christ," " This is the Blood of Christ," to which the communicant answered " Amen." The present formula is cumbersome when there are many communicants, but in the Book of 1662 there is no latitude granted either for shortening the forms or for ministering to more than one person at a time. The Bishops at Lambeth in 1888 recommended that some relief be given here, and the 1928 Rite provides that, when a comprehensive formula has once been said, the former or latter half may be said to each communicant, and it also, " when occasion requires," permits saying " the whole form of words once to each row of communicants." [1]

The Post-Communion

The Lord's Prayer immediately after the Communion has evidently the intention of thanksgiving, and for that reason has the Doxology added to it. This prayer formed a part of all Liturgies, not after the Communion, however, but before it, and that was the position assigned to it by Cranmer in the first

---

[1] The Scottish Liturgy omits the second half.

Prayer Book and the position which it occupies in the Scottish Liturgy. Bishop Barry says: "In 1549, as in most ancient Liturgies, both of the East and of the West, the Lord's Prayer was joined with the Consecration Prayer as an integral part of the Consecration. The alteration (for what reason is unknown) was made in 1552"; Dean Luckock says: "It is obviously more appropriate to pray for 'our daily bread' before than after receiving it; and it is therefore a matter of regret that the foreign compilers of the second Prayer Book took upon themselves, in face of the unbroken usage of fifteen centuries, to alter the position of the Lord's Prayer."

After the Lord's Prayer follow two alternative forms, the Prayer of Oblation and the Thanksgiving. The former came after the Consecration and before the Communion in the first Prayer Book. As it then stood, somewhat fuller in form than we have it now, "it brought out," says Dr. Barry, "the whole idea of the Sacrifice, closely connecting (after ancient precedence) the 'Memorial' of the One Great Sacrifice, pleading it before God, with our Eucharistic Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and our Dedicatory Sacrifice of ourselves. . . . This connection is now lost." Canon Warren, who is a consistent apologist for the revision of 1662, finds it hard to justify this change. "It is," he says, "the most indefensible and inexplicable of all the changes in the service. In every ancient Liturgy, as in the Prayer Book of 1549 and in the Scottish and American Communion Offices, the Oblation comes in what is obviously its appropriate place, in the Prayer of Consecration and before the Communion." He adds: "The only possible explanation seems to be that our Reformers may have thought that it was after reception rather than before reception, when all have united themselves in the closest band of union, that we can most appropriately offer the prayer that 'we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins and all other benefits of his passion.'" In the present American Book, as in the English 1928 Liturgy, the Lord's Prayer comes at the end of the Consecration Prayer, which includes the Prayer of Oblation.

Thanksgiving after Communion was a feature of the primitive Liturgies, but the form in our Prayer Book was new in 1549. It is offered in the name of all those "who have received these holy mysteries," and ends with a prayer for grace to continue in the holy fellowship, of which the partaking at the same table is a symbol, and to do the good works which life in Christ implies.

The Angelic Hymn, commonly called (from the opening words in the Latin form) the *Gloria in Excelsis*, comes in very fitly here, though in this position it is peculiar to the English Rite. It is not found in the Eastern Liturgies, though it was used in the East as a morning hymn as early as the fourth century. It is found in the Western Liturgies from the sixth century at the opening of the service, and similarly it was placed in the first Prayer Book just before the Collect for the day. The change to its present position in 1552, contrary to most changes made at that time, is generally approved.

A rubric in the 1928 Book permits the insertion before the Blessing of one or more "Collects, contained in this Book, or sanctioned by the Bishop." The Blessing with which the service closes is a beautiful and appropriate one, peculiar to the Anglican Liturgy. It was composed in 1549, the first part being taken from Phil. iv. 7, and the latter part from the ancient blessing in the name of the Holy Trinity.

One of the rubrics at the end of the service directs that if any of the consecrated Bread and Wine remain, the Priest and any communicants whom he shall call shall reverently eat and drink the same immediately after the Blessing. The Lambeth Judgment (1890) affirmed that "the cleansing of the vessels appears to be not an improper completion of the act." This cleansing is commonly called the Ablutions. A custom has grown up in some churches of singing the *Nunc Dimittis* here, but this has neither the recognition of the Prayer Book nor any Liturgical precedent. Nor is there any authority (except in the Roman Church) for reading what is sometimes called the "Last Gospel." In the Mediaeval Church the Priest said the first fourteen verses of St. John's Gospel as he returned to the vestry. There is, of course, no need for him to do so now, as no such thing is appointed in our Liturgy, though as an act of private devotion it is innocent and appropriate.

Supplementary Notes

There are several points which call for notice in the rubrics following the office, the first being the "convenient number to communicate with the Priest." The object of this rubric was to discourage solitary

Masses and to encourage communion among the laity. The minimum number of communicants in the English Prayer Book is three. The Canadian Book reduces it to two. The Scottish and American Books omit the rubric altogether. The English 1928 Rite has an introductory rubric: "It is much to be wished that at every celebration of the Lord's Supper the worshippers present, not being reasonably hindered, will communicate with the Priest."

Another rubric requires that "every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one." If to attend Mass without communicating in former days was not sufficient, still less is the modern habit of attending Mattins or Evensong and forsaking the Lord's Table. In the Seventeenth Century Statutes of the Charterhouse, the famous London School, it is prescribed that "the Master and Preacher shall have in care and charge to see that the whole household and those of the School of the age of fifteen years and upwards shall receive the blessed Sacrament yearly at the three solemn feasts of Christmas, Easter and Whitsuntide, unless they be satisfied of some lawful and just cause of their failing." It may be pointed out that the requirement to communicate at Easter does not necessarily mean Easter Day, but any time within the week following, for the festival extends to and includes the Sunday following.

The direction for the reverent consumption of what remains of the consecrated elements was introduced in 1662 and was not intended (as is sometimes supposed) to forbid reservation for the Communion of the Sick, but to prevent the shocking profanation, not unknown in the days of the Puritan ascendancy, of the Priest carrying what was left of the consecrated bread and wine to his own house, to eat and drink the same as common food. This they claimed the liberty to do under the original rubric, which merely said: "And if any of the Bread and Wine remain, the Curate shall have it to his own use." Bishop Overall, writing before the rubric was changed, says that it "refers only to that which remains without consecration," and adds: "How shamefully they act who abuse this rubric to excuse so great a crime." Reservation for the sick was provided for in 1549 and was practised by the Non-jurors and in the Scottish Church. While it is contrary to the letter of the rubric of 1662, it has been sanctioned by many English Bishops. It is distinctly allowed in the 1928 Book "only for the Communion of the Sick." Reservation for the purpose of adoration or benediction is on a different footing altogether, and is a Roman custom which was unknown in ancient times. "No trace can be found in early records of the Church either in the East or West," says Mr. Staley, "of any adoration of the sacramental Presence apart from the Eucharistic Service."

The Declaration on kneeling, commonly called the "Black Rubric," which is omitted in the American Prayer Book, was inserted in the Prayer Book of 1552 at the last moment, without lawful authority, because John Knox, in the absence of any direction in the matter, had substituted sitting for kneeling at the reception. It was not a part of the Prayer Book, and did not appear in subsequent revisions until 1662, when it was again inserted to meet the Puritan objection that kneeling favoured the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The phrase of the original, however, denying "any real and substantial presence there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood," which might seem to question whether the Body and Blood were "verily and indeed taken and received," was altered to read "any corporal presence," etc. As it now stands, what is denied, says Bishop Barry, is "a natural and carnal presence such as is implied in the theory of Transubstantiation."

Some controversy has arisen over a new rubric in the 1928 Book, just before the Communion Service, which states that "*It is an ancient and laudable custom of the Church to receive this Holy Sacrament fasting. Yet for the avoidance of all scruple it is hereby declared that such preparation may be used or not used, according to every man's conscience in the sight of God.*"

This lays down no definite rule, and cites no canonical authority. But the question arises whether, if it was a Catholic custom everywhere observed, it is not therefore binding. There is no doubt about its antiquity. Tertullian (*c.* 230) mentions it, and St. Augustine (430) never heard of a time when it was not observed. It would appear to have been almost universally followed both in East and West up to the time of the Reformation. It was never repudiated or abandoned by the English Church, but gradually, owing largely to changes in social conditions, it was neglected; though there were always pious souls who reverently observed it.

Ancient and laudable as it is, it is an ecclesiastical and not a scriptural rule, and we dare not teach, as

St. Thomas Aquinas did, that non-fasting communion is a mortal sin. There is wisdom and charity in what Dr. Pusey wrote in one of his Spiritual Letters: "I believe non-fasting communion comes under our Blessed Lord's rule, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice,' and I feel sure that if He were here, He would dispense with the custom Himself in many cases."

CHAPTER IX

OF THE OCCASIONAL OFFICES

What Baptism Means

THE fundamental importance of Baptism has always been recognized in the Church. It was a universal rule laid down by our Blessed Lord Himself that all who accepted the teaching of the Gospel should be baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (Matt. xxviii. 19). It was the only entrance into Christ's Kingdom, for He said: " Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God " (John iii. 5). It was not merely a sign to the public of grace already conferred, but was a means of grace. When the people, pricked to the heart by St. Peter's preaching on the day of Pentecost, asked " What shall we do to be saved? " the answer was: " Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost " (Acts ii. 38). Though St. Paul was converted by the revelation of Christ in the voice from heaven and the vision, yet he was sent to Ananias to learn what he was to do, and he was told, " Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins " (Acts xxii. 16); so afterwards he could say that we are saved " by the washing (or font) of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost " (Titus iii. 5).

Baptism was the sign of the new Covenant, as Circumcision was of the old, and the question arose in the time of St. Cyprian (258) whether the analogy was so close that (as in the case of circumcision) baptism should not be administered until a child was eight days old. A council of thirty-six Bishops discussed the matter and unanimously agreed that infants might be baptized as soon as they were born. The Christian covenant was certainly not to be narrower than the covenant of Abraham. So the Church has always baptized infants. St. Augustine (430) alludes to this custom as "that which the whole Church practices, and which has not been instituted by councils, but was ever in use." The action of Christ Himself when He took the little children in His arms showed that they were capable of receiving blessing, though His disciples could not see what good it could do and would have kept them from Him. It is generally held that the only things which bar the working of God's grace are impenitence on the part of the receiver, or unbelief, and infants are incapable of either of these.

The essentials of Baptism are water, and the use of our Lord's own words, "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," as the rubric at the end of the office for *Private Baptism of Infants* declares.

The mode of Baptism varies, and apparently there never was any uniformity in the matter, though the prevailing mode in the East seems to have been immersion. The early paintings in the Catacombs, however, represent the candidate standing in the water, while water is poured upon his head. It is difficult to believe that the 3000 who were baptized immediately after St. Peter's Pentecostal sermon (Acts ii. 41) were immersed, for Jerusalem was on a hill, and water had to be brought in by a conduit from Gihon. It is also difficult to suppose that there were facilities for immersion in the house of the jailer at Philippi, when he and all his household were baptized the night of the earthquake (Acts xvi. 33). The symbolism of the water was purification, and we learn something of what this was from the "waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece" (John ii. 6). It is sometimes maintained that the word in the original, which is sometimes translated "baptize" and sometimes "wash," means always to immerse, and, acting on this assumption, a revision of the New Testament was brought out by the American Bible Union in 1864 with extraordinary renderings. Thus it said (Mark vii. 4) that the Jews, "when they come from the market, except they immerse themselves they eat not, and many other things there are which they have received to hold, as the immersing of cups and pots, brasen vessels and couches." In 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, it stated that "our fathers . . . were immersed unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," whereas the commonly received idea is that the Israelites passed over dry-shod, and the Egyptians were immersed in the Red Sea. Another point that is raised as implying immersion is the fact that St. Paul speaks of Baptism as burial with Christ; but it is interesting to note that the burial rites, not only among Christians, but among the Greeks and Romans of pre-Christian days, required only the casting of three handfuls of earth upon the body, as is common with us to-day. Compare with this the earliest directions we have for the administration of Baptism in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (about 100), which says it is to be done in the Name of the Holy Trinity, in running water preferably, though it is sufficient to pour water three times upon the head.

Sources of our Baptismal Offices

In our consideration of the early Liturgies we noted that there was a striking similarity in their form, suggesting that they were all derived from an original norm; but with the Baptismal services this is not so. There was no common form beyond the essentials already mentioned, but diverse symbolical ceremonies were introduced in early times, presumably by the authority of individual bishops. Tertullian (*c.* 230) speaks of renouncing the devil, of the "responses," of the triple immersion, for the three Persons of the Holy Trinity, and of anointing with oil. St. Cyril of Jerusalem tells (347) of the candidate turning to the West to renounce Satan, and then to the East to say the Creed; of putting on white garments; of unction, an ancient custom symbolical of anointing of the Holy Ghost; of Confirmation, which was regarded as the completion of Baptism, and of the partaking of the Holy Communion.

The main source of our Baptismal services is the Sarum Manual. In this there were three distinct offices: *The Order of Making a Catechumen*, *The Blessing of the Font*, and *The Rite of Baptism.* The first of these took place at the church door, and began with signing the child with the Cross. It contained certain ceremonies which are not now used, such as touching the lips with salt, and the ears and mouth with spittle. This last was called the *Effeta*, from the word *Ephphatha* which our Lord spoke to the deaf man (Mark vii. 34). The child was then taken into the church and bidden to enter into the Temple of God. The water in the font was changed once a month, and the consecration of the water was a separate rite, including a form of Litany. The rite of Baptism began with the vows of renunciation and of faith, and after the actual Baptism came the anointing, the putting on of the chrisom, or white robe, and the placing of a lighted taper in the child's hand.

The framers of the Prayer Book undertook to simplify the old service by omitting ceremonies which seemed to them unedifying, and adding such exhortations and explanations as they thought needful for the times. Accordingly, in the office for the *Public Baptism of Infants* they have in the main followed the lines of the Sarum rite, but have added hortatory portions from the *Consultation* of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne (1543). The office in the Prayer Book of 1549 retained some features which were struck out in 1552 at the instigation of Bucer, including the blessing of the Font, which, however, was restored in somewhat different form in 1662. "Bucer," says Bishop Frere, "was possessed of an unreasoning horror of the benediction of material objects, and wished to have no trace of such a thing in the Baptismal service." There are some like him in this at the present day.

Until 1662 the same office served for the baptism of children and of adults. It was chiefly the neglect of Baptism during the Great Rebellion which rendered a form of *Baptism of such as are of Riper Years* necessary. The American Prayer Book has only one office, with certain alternative forms for infants or adults. The form for *The Administration of Private Baptism in Houses* is merely an adaptation of the public office for cases of necessity, and a rubric at the beginning of this office bids the "curates" warn the people that "*without like great cause and necessity they procure not their children to be baptized at home in their houses*." Note too that if the child recovers he is to be publicly received into the Church.

The 1928 Book has changed the introductory exhortation in the office for Public Baptism of Infants by changing the statement that " all men are conceived and born in sin " into " all men are from their birth prone to sin," and saying that " God willeth all men to be saved, for God is love," and in the prayer following the reference to Noah and to the crossing of the Red Sea are omitted. The American office omits this prayer altogether. The 1928 Book has a section for the Blessing of the Water which contains a thanksgiving modelled on the Eucharistic form, beginning with the mutual salutation, followed by " Lift up your hearts," etc., and " It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should give thanks . . . for that thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins," etc. This form, which is taken from the old Sarum office, has also been adopted by the American and Scottish Churches.

Some Points to be Noted

Of the three ceremonies retained in the first Prayer Book—Exorcism, Anointing and the Chrisom—which were abolished in 1552, Bishop Barry says: "The first may perhaps have implied some exaggerated conception of the power of Satan over the unbaptized; but the other two were sound and beautiful in their symbolic meaning, and it is hard to conceive that they were liable to superstitious abuse." The service as it now stands is for the most part clear and intelligible, but a few notes, historical and otherwise, may not be superfluous.

First of all with regard to the Font, as to which the Prayer Book gives no directions. In Italy and elsewhere in the fourth and fifth centuries the Baptistery was a separate building standing near the church, and its font was large enough for the immersion of an adult, but subsequently fonts were placed in the body of the church. Yet there was not a font in every church, but the "Mother Church," which would roughly correspond with the Parish church of our own time, was the *Ecclesia Baptismalis*, or church where Baptism was to be performed. This custom again was changed, and Canon 81 (1604) directs for the Church of England that "there shall be a font of stone in every church and chapel where Baptism is to be ministered; the same to be set in the ancient usual places." The "ancient usual place," from the little church of St. Martin at Canterbury, where King Ethelbert was baptized by St. Augustine in 597, on through the centuries, was by the church door, and it is only where Puritanical ideas have prevailed that there has been any departure from this custom. At the Savoy Conference (1661) the Puritans objected to the traditional position of the Font, and the Bishops answered: "It stands as it did in primitive times, at or near the church door to signify that Baptism was the entrance into the Church mystical." In Cosin's Visitation articles, issued the following year, he asks: "Is there a font of marble, or other stone, decently wrought and covered?" Notice here the term "covered." Covers were formally authorized in England by the Constitutions of Edmund Archbishop of Canterbury in 1237. They keep the Font clean, and prevent it from becoming a receptacle for hats, or for pots of flowers at the hands of over-zealous decorators.

The rubric recommending the administration of Baptism "*upon Sundays and other Holy-days, when the most number of people come together*," and immediately after the second Lesson at Morning or Evening Prayer, is in these unregenerate days more honoured in the breach than in the observance. To treat Baptism as a private service at which only the parents and invited friends are expected to be present is to repudiate entirely the Prayer Book idea of Public Baptism. Sometimes there are practical difficulties in carrying out these rubrics, but it ought at least to be recognized that the Prayer Book ideal is the better way. The people need to be reminded of the solemnity of Holy Baptism, and it would be to edification as much now as in former days if these rubrics were observed, as is still done in some churches, and to receive the child "into the congregation of Christ's flock" would have more meaning.

With regard to the effect of Baptism, stress is laid upon the forgiveness of sin, and regeneration or new birth, as in the Catechism, where we are taught that the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism is "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." The phrase "the mystical washing away of sin" occurs in the first prayer, and in the Blessing of the Water, and the second prayer is for "remission of sins through spiritual regeneration." After the exhortation which follows the Gospel is the prayer: "Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he may be born again." Then after the Baptism the Priest is instructed to say: "This child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church," while after the Lord's Prayer is the Thanksgiving, "that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit." Note that in the reception of a child after private Baptism the minister at the opening address speaks of the child as "by the laver of Regeneration in Baptism, received into the number of the children of God," and instead of the prayer "that he may be born again" we read "that he, being born again." Then there is the definite statement. "Seeing now . . . that this child is by Baptism regenerate." St. Peter in his Pentecostal sermon (Acts ii. 38) exhorted his hearers: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," and St. Paul wrote to Titus (iii. 5): "He saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Since both the Prayer Book and the Holy Scripture connect regeneration with Baptism, it behoves us to ask what is meant by the term. There was a time when a good deal of unnecessary controversy took place over Baptismal Regeneration, but we hear little of it now. A statement of the case by Charles Simeon (1836), the well-known Evangelical leader, is admirable. "In the Baptismal service," he says, "we thank God for having regenerated the baptized infant by His Holy Spirit. Now hence it appears that, in the opinion of our reformers, regeneration and remission of sins did accompany Baptism. But in what sense did they hold this sentiment? Did they maintain that there was no need for the seed sown in the heart of the baptized person to grow up and bring forth fruit? or that he could be saved any other way than by a progressive renovation of his soul after the Divine image? Had they asserted or countenanced any such doctrine as that, it would have been impossible for any enlightened person to concur with them. But . . . they have, and that too in this very prayer, taught us to look unto God for that total change, both of heart and life, which long since their days has begun to be expressed by the term regeneration." There is a parallel in the case of a foreign-born person who wishes to become a British citizen. He formally renounces his own nationality and takes an oath of allegiance to the King. Then he receives his Letters of Naturalization and has the same rights and privileges, and the same responsibilities, as if he had been born a British subject. He is politically born again into the Kingdom of Great Britain. So those who are by nature aliens are, through Baptism, religiously born into the Kingdom of

God, and are partakers of its rights, its privileges and its responsibilities.

Perhaps a word should be said too on the question of Godparents. Why do we have them? The origin of the office was at least as early as the second century. In the case of adults it was necessary to have trustworthy sureties for the character and good intentions of those who came to be baptized. Tertullian (*c.* 230) calls these persons Sponsors, and he says they were required to answer for infants and others unable to answer for themselves. The Puritans objected at the Savoy Conference (1661) to Godfathers and Godmothers answering for children, and the Bishops replied: "If guardians may contract for minors, why not Sponsors?" Canon 29 (1604) enjoined that only communicants should be Sponsors.

It is to be noted that the Prayer Book assigns the ministration of Baptism to the Priest. At the Ordination of a Deacon he is admonished that it belongs to his office "in the absence of the Priest to baptize infants," the assumption being that adults must wait for a Priest; and a Lay-reader is given no authority whatever to baptize. The old Sarum rubric said: "It is not lawful for a layman or for a woman to baptize except in case of necessity." Nevertheless, Baptism by laymen is by the general consent of the Church allowed to be valid. The Canadian, American, Scottish and English Revisions all provide a form to be used by "one of those present" where a child is in danger of death and a lawful minister may not be had. Baptism in private houses is to be restricted to cases of "great cause and necessity," or (as the American Book puts it) "*except for urgent cause they seek not to have their children baptized in their houses.*

"The growth of Anabaptism, through the licentiousness of the late times crept in among us"—that is, during the Cromwellian period—is stated in the Preface of 1662 as the reason for adding an office for the *Baptism of Such as are of Riper Years.* In its structure it follows the form for Infant Baptism, but the Gospel is different, and the candidate answers for himself. The Alternative English office divides the service into (*a*) Introduction, (*b*) the Promises, (*c*) the Blessing of the Water, (*d*) the Baptism, (*e*) the Thanksgiving, (*f*) the Duties of the Godfathers and Godmothers.

Catechism and Confirmation

It is not necessary to treat of the explanation of the Catechism here, as there are various manuals available which deal specially with this; but something should be said as to its history and importance. The late Archbishop Benson said: "I believe that there never has been in the hands of any Church any manual representing the doctrines, the true spirit of the Bible, to compare with the Catechism of the Church of England." The Catechism (with the exception of the latter part dealing with the Sacraments, which was added in 1604) was inserted in the first Prayer Book in the Order of Confirmation, and the title was "*Confirmation, wherein is contained a Catechism for Children,*" and a rubric required that candidates should be able to "*answer to such questions of this short Catechism as the Bishop* (*or such as he shall appoint*) *shall at his discretion* *appose them in.*" It would be interesting to see how candidates at the present day would acquit themselves if our Bishops at Confirmation should "appose them" with questions from the Catechism.

Catechism, which means instruction by question and answer, was not altogether a new thing when the Prayer Book was drawn up. Long before the Reformation, long before the Norman Conquest, the English clergy were charged to instruct their people in the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, and manuals were put forth by different Bishops as guides to the clergy in this work. It was to convey the same instruction in another way that the Catechism was inserted in the Prayer Book of 1549, with directions that the Curate of every parish should instruct the children of his parish in some part of it half an hour before Evensong, at least once in six weeks. The present rubric assigns this catechising to Sundays and holy-days, after the second Lesson at Evening Prayer; but when this direction was given Evening Prayer was said in the afternoon. Who was the author of the first part of the Catechism we cannot say. The latter part is commonly assigned to Bishop Overall, but it was not entirely original. The first Catechism appears to have been Calvin's smaller one (1538). This with his larger one (1545) and those of Erasmus (1547) and Bullinger (1559) found favour in England for some years.

In the American Prayer Book two *Offices of Instruction* are also provided, based upon the Catechism, but with additions. The first treats of the Baptismal covenant, the Creed and the Ten Commandments, the second of the Church, the Sacraments and the Ministry. The new Scottish Book adds to the Catechism three questions on Confirmation.

Confirmation, or the Laying on of Hands, is, as Canon Warren says, "coeval with the foundation of the Christian Church," and it is thought by some to have been one of "the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God" of which our Blessed Lord spoke during the forty days which intervened between His Resurrection and His Ascension. "In the early Church," says Bishop Barry, "by a natural development from this Apostolic practice, Confirmation was looked upon as a kind of completion of Baptism, administered by Bishops alone, and considered not as a regeneration, but as a strengthening and confirming of the regeneration of Baptism." The two incidents recorded in Acts (viii. 14–17, and xix. 5–6), which are both incorporated into the Canadian Confirmation Office, and the first into the American and English Revisions as well, are quite definite. In the first case Apostles came from Jerusalem to lay hands upon the Samaritan converts whom Philip the deacon had baptized, that they might receive the Holy Ghost; and in the second the Ephesians who believed received Christian Baptism, and afterwards "Paul laid his hands upon them and the Holy Ghost came on them." Recognizing the Apostolic character of the rite, and the admonition, "Hold fast the traditions which ye have received," and also the fact that the Church in every age has used it, we cannot regard Confirmation as a matter of indifference.

It is a curious, but by no means an uncommon, misapprehension of Confirmation to regard it as something which the candidate *does*, rather than as something which *he receives ;* but so regarded it cannot claim to be a scriptural ordinance. In its extreme form this theory of Confirmation makes it the occasion when the candidate relieves his Godparents of the responsibility of seeing that the Baptismal promises are kept, and takes them upon himself. But the Catechism, which is " to be learned of every person before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop," says : " Dost thou not think that thou art bound to believe and to do as they have promised for thee? "—not " that thou *wilt be bound* after Confirmation "—and the child answers " Yes, verily; and by God's help so I will." It is God's help—the gift of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter (or strengthener)—which he seeks in Confirmation. The renewal of the vows made at Baptism and public acknowledgment of their obligation was only prefixed to the Confirmation Office in 1662. There is no such thing in the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, 1559 or 1604. Its fitness, however, is obvious. It is the Bishop's examination of the candidates to see whether they are in a fit state to receive the grace of Confirmation.

In the Eastern Churches Confirmation is called the Seal or the Anointing, because St. Paul says : " He which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and *hath anointed* us, is God ; who hath also *sealed* us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts " (2 Cor. i. 21, 22), and " Ye were *sealed* by the Holy Spirit of promise " (Eph. i. 13), and again : " the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are *sealed* unto the day of redemption "

(Eph. iv. 30). St John also says: "Ye have an *unction* from the Holy One" (1 John ii. 20)," and "the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you" (27). It is administered to infants in the East immediately after Baptism, not by laying on of hands, as with us, but by anointing with oil, which is done by the presbyter, the only part reserved for the Bishop being the hallowing of the oil. The use of unction, symbolical of the Holy Spirit, at Confirmation dates back at least to the first half of the second century, and it was used everywhere before the Reformation. In the Middle Ages the service was a very simple one. There was the prayer for the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit, which Bishop Barry says is "of immemorial antiquity," and the anointing with chrism (olive oil mixed with balsam and spices), and that was all. The custom of saying the prayer by the Bishop with hand outstretched over the candidates was perhaps meant to signify the laying on of hands. At the anointing the Bishop dipped the tip of his right thumb in the chrism and with it made the sign of the Cross upon the forehead of each candidate. Although there was no direction for the use of chrism, the Prayer Book of 1549 had a prayer: "Confirm and strengthen them with the inward unction of thy Holy Ghost," and there was the rubrical direction given that "*the Bishop shall cross them in the forehead and lay his hand upon their head, saying,* 'N., I sign thee with the sign of the Cross and lay my hand upon thee. In the name of the Father,'" etc. This is restored in the Scottish Prayer Book.

The American *Order of Confirmation* begins with a form of presentation of candidates similar to that in the

Ordinal—" Reverend Father in God, I present unto you these persons to receive the Laying on of Hands," to which the Canadian Book adds a caution from the Bishop relative to due preparation, and an assurance by the Minister of their fitness. The Preface in the English Order (for which the Scottish Book allows the substitution of a suitable address, and which is considerably altered in the Canadian Book and omitted in the American Revision) was inserted in 1662, and is based upon two rubrics printed before the Catechism in 1549 and in subsequent revisions. In its original form, instead of " ratify and confirm " it read " ratify and confess." Whether the alteration, which involves the use of the same word in two entirely different senses, was intentional, or merely a printer's error, it is impossible to say. The English Revision restores the old rubric in almost its original form, and has a new Preface emphasizing the Apostolic character of Confirmation.

Holy Matrimony

Marriage is not essentially a religious ceremony but a natural compact between two persons. The mutual consent given before witnesses recognized by law makes the marriage legal. While the Church recognizes such marriages as valid, may we not say that Holy Matrimony means something more than this? The blessing of a Bishop or Priest was given and the Holy Communion formed a part of the service. While less stress is laid upon it, this latter feature is not entirely lost. The Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 both directed that the newly-married couple should receive the Holy Communion the same day they were married, and the rubric at the end of our present office states that it is "convenient," that is to say, appropriate, that they should do so. The Canadian, Scottish, English, and American Revisions provide a proper Collect, Epistle and Gospel.

The marriage of those who are nearly related has always been forbidden by the Church, and a table of prohibited degrees drawn up by Archbishop Parker in 1563 and incorporated into the Canons of 1604 has been for many years inserted in the Prayer Book. In the Canadian Book it is simplified in its language and printed just before the Marriage Service. The principle upon which it is based is that since man and wife are "one flesh," a man's wife's relations are his own. Affinity, or connection by marriage, is on the same footing as consanguinity or relation by blood. If this is not true there is nothing wrong in a man marrying his stepmother, or his daughter-in-law. If it is true, the impropriety of a man marrying his sister-in-law is at once apparent. In cases where the law of the land is at variance with the law of the Church the clergy are, under their ordination vows, bound by the Church's law, and can neither perform marriages within the prohibited degrees nor recognize them when performed by others.

It is clearly the intention of the Prayer Book that marriages should be performed in churches, and not in private houses, and this is perhaps implied in the title: "*The form of Solemnization of Matrimony.*" At the appointed time the persons to be married are directed to "come into the body of the Church with their friends and neighbours." It is also clear from the rubrics that the marriage should be performed by one who is in Priest's Orders. A legal decision on this point before the House of Lords in 1843 stated that the rules of the Church of England required the service to be performed by a Priest, and, according to the old Canon Law, a Deacon could not marry because he could not pronounce the benedictions contained in the service. Marriage by a Deacon, though valid, is quite irregular, and properly involves the omission of the nuptial benedictions.

The law concerning the publication of Banns varies in different places; but the rule of the English Book that they be published at the Morning or Evening Service on three several Sundays, and if the persons do not both live in the same parish that they may be published in both parishes, is sufficient in any case.

When the Prayer Book was drawn up the forms of the Sarum Manual were pretty closely followed. The rubric at the beginning of the service directing the man to stand on the right and the woman on the left is open to misunderstanding, but was perfectly clear in the old service, which ordered the man to stand at the right hand of the woman, and the woman at the left hand of the man.

The opening address is based on the Sarum office, but was enlarged by the insertion of " the causes for which Matrimony was ordained." This feature is left out of the American Prayer Book, and has been variously recast in the other revisions.

The Espousal (or Betrothal) was in former days a separate service, constituting a formal engagement to be married, and might take place some time before the marriage. In this part of the service the Priest first questions the two contracting parties whether each will have the other as spouse in a lifelong union. A similar formula is used in each case; but the man is asked if he will "comfort her," and the woman whether she will "obey and serve him," and each answers "I will." In the American and English Revisions the first formula is left unchanged, and the second is made identical with it. Then they plight their troth (or pledge their honour), and here again the new American, Scottish and English Revisions make the woman's vow identical with the man's. The term worship, "with my body I thee worship" is altered in the Canadian and English Books to "honour," which retains the original meaning. In St. Luke xiv. 10 we read, "Then shalt thou have worship in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee." Wiclif's Bible (Matt. xix. 19) reads, "Worschipe thi fadir and modir." The American Book omits this clause. The use of the ring in marriage goes back to pre-Christian days as a token of the marriage covenant. To regard it as a "symbol of eternity, constancy and integrity of love" is somewhat fanciful. Is it not sufficient to think of it as the link that binds the woman to her husband, which he places upon her hand and she willingly receives in the face of witnesses? The Sarum Manual directed the man to place the ring upon the woman's thumb as he said "In the name of the Father," on the second finger as he said "and of the Son," on the third as he said "and of the Holy Ghost," and as he said "Amen" to place it upon the fourth finger and leave it there.

The American office has for optional use a brief form of Blessing the ring. There was a form of Blessing the ring in the Sarum office, part of which is retained in the prayer said after the giving of the ring, in which is inserted the clause concerning Isaac and Rebecca. This clause has to a great extent lost its meaning now. When it was first introduced in 1549, it was the custom to lay upon the book with the ring "other tokens of spousage, as gold or silver," and the prayer read: "As Isaac and Rebecca (after bracelets and jewels of gold given of the one to the other for tokens of their matrimony), lived faithfully together." In 1552 this was left out and the clause inserted "with the accustomed duty to the Priest and Clerk." The new American and English Prayer Books both omit the reference to Isaac and Rebecca, and fitly enough, for Rebecca's deceiving of her husband in the matter of the blessing of Jacob was hardly the part of a faithful wife. The American Book inserts before this prayer the Lord's Prayer and (with questionable propriety) prints the *Oremus* ("Let us pray") before it instead of before the prayer to which it belongs.

The joining of hands by the Priest—there is a Roman custom of tying them with the Priest's stole—and the pronouncement of the Marriage are borrowed directly from Hermann's *Consultation*. A blessing, translated (with slight variations) from the Sarum Manual, closes the first part of the service. In the Prayer Book of 1549 the sign of the Cross accompanied this Blessing, but it was omitted in 1552. Here the service ends in the American Prayer Book.

The second part, drawn for the most part from the old Sarum Office, which Dr. Barry calls the "Post-Matrimonial Service" and Dr. Frere the "Wedding proper," takes place in the Chancel, and was meant to be preparatory to Holy Communion. Psalm cxxviii. is to be sung as an Introit—"*the Minister or clerks going to the Lord's Table.*" The English Revision alters this rubric to read: "*Then the Priest, followed by the man and woman, shall go to the Lord's Table while there is said or sung this Psalm following.*" The newly-married pair kneel there, and the Priest, turning towards them, says the prayers, which closely follow the old Service, and are of a benedictory character. A different prayer for the gift of children is provided in the Scottish Book, and this, together with the latter portion of the following prayer, is inserted in the American Book for permissive use just after the prayer "O eternal God." The prayer for children is altered in the Canadian Book and is the same as in the Alternative Form in the 1928 Book. The sign of the Cross was made by the Priest both at the first and again at the final Blessing, according to the first Prayer Book. The 1928 Book inserts this rubric after the Blessing: "*If there be a Communion the foregoing Prayer and Blessing shall be said over the man and woman immediately before the final Blessing of the congregation at the Communion.*" The old rule directed the use of the Collect for Trinity Sunday, with the Epistle, 1 Corinthians vi. 15–20, and Gospel, St. Matthew xix. 3–6. The special Collect, Epistle and Gospel provided in the Scottish Book are adopted by the Canadian also, but those in the new English Book are different. The Address or homily, which is a weaving together of texts of Scripture concerning marriage, is to be used when there is no sermon on the subject, the implication being that a Sermon is better. If the Holy Communion is celebrated, the Sermon (or Address) should come in its proper place. In the 1928 Book it is provided that "*If there be no Communion, nor sermon declaring the duties of man and wife, there shall be read some portion of Scripture, or the Priest shall say the Exhortation provided in the Form of* 1662." "*After the Gospel shall be said a Sermon*" was the rule in 1552, continued from 1549. This implies the omission of the Nicene Creed, a method of shortening the service which was common, though it was nowhere expressly allowed in the Prayer Book until the 1928 English Revision.

The Visitation of the Sick

Visiting and caring for the sick has always been recognized as a work of mercy by the Church and enjoined upon the clergy as a ministerial duty. They were always to be ready for this work, and, according to Lynwood's *Constitutions* (1433), were required to perform it when summoned, promptly and cheerfully. The rubric at the beginning of our Office directs that notice shall be given to the Minister of the Parish, but if this is not done a knowledge of the need of his ministrations is sufficient call, and

> "The sick and the disconsolate
> Should on no man's convenience wait."

To visit the sick, however, does not of necessity imply the use of the Prayer Book form. *The Order for the Visitation of the Sick* stands upon a different footing from the other portions of the Prayer Book, in that it is in no sense a public but a private office, and consequently is not binding upon the clergy as the other services are. The subscription which the clergy make at ordination is: "In Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." The Prayer Book service in this case is, as Dr. Feltoe well says, "too set and formal in structure and language for general use," and "is at the most only suitable in the case of a well-instructed member of the Church who is, moreover, in possession of his faculties, and not too much exhausted by suffering to benefit by what is said." The American Book says: "The following Service, or any part thereof, may be used at the discretion of the Minister." The direction in the 67th Canon (1604) is: "When any person is dangerously sick . . . the minister or curate, having knowledge thereof, shall resort unto him or her (if the disease be not known, or probably suspected, to be infectious) to instruct and comfort them in their distress, according to the order of the Communion Books, if he be no preacher; or, if he be a preacher, then as he shall think most needful and convenient." And then follows a direction for tolling the passing-bell, "when any is passing out of this life."

Both the history and the character of the Office indicate that it was not intended for constant use, but was rather a service for those who are dangerously sick. Bishop Barry says: "This service, excepting the Exhortations, is drawn, with much correction and simplification, from three closely-connected services in the Sarum Manual: 'the Order for the Visitation of the Sick,' the service of 'Extreme Unction,' and the 'Commendation of the Soul.'"

While the old form of Unction was not retained in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, direction was given for the Priest to anoint the sick person, if he desired it, and a new prayer was inserted giving prominence to bodily healing. It asks that God, of His great mercy, would restore bodily health and strength to serve Him, and send release of all pains, troubles and diseases both in body and mind. The growing feeling in favour of the restoration of the rite of Unction as a means of healing is noteworthy, and many Bishops have sanctioned the use by their clergy of the form given in the Prayer Book of 1549. A form for Unction, differing from the Edwardian form, but of the same character, is found in the American Book, and a fuller form in the Scottish Book.

If the Order for the Visitation of the Sick is not sufficient for the "private monitions and exhortations" enjoined upon the clergy, it is nevertheless very useful and suggestive, and almost every attempt at revision has added to the wealth of the material here offered to the Pastor. The Exhortations, drawn up nearly four centuries ago, cannot be used at the present day with much profit and they are omitted from the American, Scottish and English Revisions. A rubric in the former directs the Minister to "address the sick person on the meaning and use of the time of sickness, and the opportunity it affords for spiritual profit," and the next rubric suggests examination as to faith and repentance. Forms of Exhortation and an Act of Prayer and Blessing are given in the English Revision.

The rubric directing the Priest to move the sick person to make a special confession of sins, if he feel his conscience troubled, and the special form of Absolution were omitted from the American Prayer Book, but the rubric was restored at the last revision, with the direction that " on evidence of his repentance the Minister shall assure him of God's mercy and forgiveness." In the Irish Book the form of Absolution in the Communion Service is prescribed here. The Absolution provided in the English Book (which was ordered in 1549 to be " used in all private confessions ") is indicative in form—" I absolve thee "—and follows the old Latin. It has been objected to by the Eastern ecclesiastics as too strong, but Canon Warren reminds us that, although it has an absolute sound, the words " are surrounded by phrases which indicate the delegated character of the Absolution, and that the real power of absolution rests with Jesus Christ. It is He who has left power to His Church to absolve. It is by His authority that absolution is pronounced, and it is conveyed in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

The sentence " O Saviour of the world," etc., which follows the Psalm, is one of the few survivals of the old Antiphons which were used to give special application to the Psalms. They used to be sung before and after the Psalm. In the Litany " O Lord, arise, help us," etc., is another, but there the Psalm has almost disappeared. The 1928 Book gives choice of a number of Psalms, to be preceded and followed by the Antiphon. A notable enrichment of the American Visitation Office is the provision of several Psalms with Antiphons and Collects to be used at the Minister's discretion. The Scottish Office is full and helpful. The final benediction, which, says Warren, occurs at the end of the ancient Visitation Offices of the Celtic Church, is an enlargement of the old Aaronic blessing (Numb. vi. 24–26), which in its triple form is thought to be a foreshadowing of the Holy Trinity. This form of blessing is very frequently used in our public services, but (strange to say) is seldom given as it is found in the Prayer Book.

The Communion of the Sick

The Communion of the Sick is the natural and proper sequel to the Visitation. Repentance, faith, confession of sins, absolution—all these lead up to and are a fitting preparation for the soul's Communion with Christ in His Holy Sacrament and (where circumstances are such as to permit it), the Visitation service or a part of it may precede the Communion as one of the rubrics following this Office suggests. If we are right in using the words " preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life " at the delivery to each communicant of the consecrated elements, then certainly there are none to whom they come with more fullness of meaning than to those who are sick. And especially is this true of those who are apparently drawing near to death. From very early times the communion of the dying was spoken of as the *Viaticum*, which means provision for the way. So essential was it considered that the restrictions of discipline were removed in the case of those who were at the point of death and desired to communicate. Our own Archbishop Theodore (690) directed that if any one under censure who had not professed repentance should fall sick and ask to receive the Holy Communion it should not be denied him.

In the primitive Church it was the custom after the public Celebration to reserve portions of the Holy Sacrament to be sent by the hands of the deacons to those who were sick, and in the Prayer Book of 1549 provision was made that, if there was a Celebration in the Church on the same day, the Priest should reserve "*so much of the sacrament of the body and blood as should serve the sick person, and so many as shall communicate with him* (*if there be any*)," and should go as soon as convenient and minister the same, using a service consisting of the Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, the Administration and the Collect, "Almighty and everlasting God, we heartily thank thee," etc.

There is a rubric in the Scottish Book which says: "*According to long existing custom in the Scottish Church the Presbyter may reserve so much of the Consecrated Gifts as may be required for the Communion of the Sick and others who could not be present at the celebration in church.*" The directions both for such reservation and for celebrating in the sick man's house were omitted from the Book of 1552, and the rubrical directions from that time until 1662 were very vague as to what should be done, but reservation was recognized in the Latin Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth (1560). In the Book of 1662 the letter of the rubric after the Communion Office directs the reverent consumption, immediately after the Blessing, of any consecrated Bread and Wine remaining, but many Bishops of late years have given permission to Priests working in crowded districts to reserve a portion for communicating the sick if necessity require. Reservation is provided for in the 1928 Book, but it " shall be reserved only for the Communion of the Sick, shall be ministered in both kinds, and shall be used for no other purpose whatever."

It is worthy of note that here in the out-of-the-way rubric before the *Communion of the Sick*, and here only, the Prayer Book sets forth the duty of frequent Communion: " *The Curates shall diligently, from time to time, . . . exhort their Parishioners to the often receiving of the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, when it shall be publicly ministered in the Church.*" When this rule is followed the urgency for special celebrations for the sick is much less; nevertheless, if the sick person is desirous to receive the Communion in his house, the privilege is not to be denied him.

The first care is to have a " *convenient place in the sick man's house, with all things necessary so prepared, that the Curate may reverently minister.*" Whether it is in the church or in a private house it is the Lord's own service, and is not to be performed in a slovenly or haphazard way, but with that dignity and solemnity which its character demands. A decent table with fair linen cloth, proper communion vessels with the requisite linens, clean and comely vestments for the Priest, and such other " ornaments " as are suitable—these things are not only fitting from the point of view of giving to God the best that we have, but they are at the same time a great help to the devotion and comfort of the sick person.

The special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel were quite original in 1549, as the compilers knew of no ancient precedent to direct them. There is here the same characterization of sickness as God's chastisement given in love to His children which marks the Visitation Office, and which one cannot but feel to be in many cases unapt. Many kinds of sickness are avoidable if proper care is taken, and others we may reasonably class among " those evils which the craft and subtility of the devil or man worketh against us." The permission given in the Irish and Canadian Books to use the Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the day is valuable, but there is still room for improvement in this respect. The American Book provides an alternative Collect, Epistle and Gospel, which are brief, and which look rather to restoration of health than to approaching death. The English 1928 Book also provides alternatives which are more comforting, and so do the Irish and Scottish Revisions. The first alternative Collect in the English Book prays for restoration to health of body and mind, and the second is the first of the six collects at the end of the Communion Office, and the Epistle (2 Cor. i. 3–5) tells of the consolation in Christ for those who share His sufferings.

The form of shortening the service was apparently considered by the compilers and by subsequent revisers of the Prayer Book as the minimum allowable, and it will be noted that it contains all the latter part of the service. This continued to be the unbroken tradition of the Anglican Church until the Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland in 1887 declared it sufficient to use the Confession, Absolution, Prayer of Consecration, Form of Delivery of the Sacrament, the Lord's Prayer and Blessing, and this is copied in the Canadian Book.

This abridgment not only cuts out the distinctively eucharistic portions of the service, as has already been pointed out—from "Lift up your hearts" to the Prayer of Humble Access, which are common to all Liturgies—but it endorses the Roman theory that the Priest's saying the words of administration spoken by our Blessed Lord to His Disciples at the Last Supper is the essential part of Consecration. The requirement of the American Book is much better: "*The Confession and the Absolution*, Lift up your hearts, *etc.*, *through the* Sanctus; *The Prayer of Consecration ending with these words*, partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood; *The Prayer of Humble Access; The Communion; The Lord's Prayer; The Blessing*." A short form of Confession and Absolution is also provided for the service. There is a method of communicating in both kinds together, called *Intinction*, which is done either with a spoon (as is the custom in the Greek Church in communicating infants) or by dipping the edge of the wafer into the chalice and then placing in the mouth of the communicant. This is used in a number of parishes in the American Church, with the knowledge and consent of the Bishop, but is not officially recognized. A wider permission is given in the English 1928 Book, where the form is: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, and His Blood, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving."

The Burial of the Dead

So strong was the feeling in the early Church that the faithful, " after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity," that (in contrast with the heathen, who buried their dead under cover of night) the early Christians, as Dean Plumptre points out, " gave to the funeral procession somewhat of the character of a triumph." It took place in daylight, and friends marched, some carrying branches of palm and olive, others lights or censers, while they sang joyous anthems such as " Right dear in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints," " Turn again unto thy rest, O my soul, for the Lord hath rewarded thee." " The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God." There was a celebration of the Eucharist, to signify that those who had gone before and those who remained were one communion in Christ. Leaves of laurel and ivy were placed in the coffin and flowers scattered over the body, which was laid face upward, with feet towards the east, awaiting the rising of the Sun of Righteousness.

In the Sarum Manual there was a service for the " Commendation of the Soul," and another for the " Burial of the Dead," and from these an Order, very much shortened and simplified, was drawn up for the Prayer Book of 1549. This Order was recast in 1552. Psalms cxvi, cxxxix, and cxlvi, with their dominant note of praise and hope, did not seem sufficiently funereal to the men behind that revision, and they were set aside for those which we now have, and the commendation of the soul to God, which five minutes before death was considered a pious duty—as witness the beautiful Commendatory Prayer in the Visitation of the Sick—after the soul had left the body was esteemed superstitious and ungodly. Then the prayer for the departed was reduced to the general petition "that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory."

Bishop Drury says: "It is not surprising nor is it out of line with the historical development of our services . . . that in the sad and tragic experiences of the Great War it was widely felt that the cautious attitude of our formularies, while justified in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, did not give sufficient expression to the reasonable longings of the bereaved."

The opening rubric forbids the use of this Office for those who die unbaptized or excommunicate, and for suicides. In the first case the reason is obvious. The unbaptized have never been admitted members of Christ's Church on earth, and it would be as much out of place to use the Office for Christian burial in such a case as to use (say) the ritual of the Freemasons for those who have never joined the Masonic Order. The second case applies to those who died under formal sentence of excommunication, and the third to those in whose case the coroner's inquest has resulted in a verdict of suicide. The rubric in the 1928 Book, however, leaves difficult cases, "if time and opportunity permit," to the decision of the Bishop. The alternative in the second rubric of going into the church or towards the grave provides for the case of infectious disease in which it would be dangerous to take the body into the church. The Priest is not supposed to come with the funeral procession to the church, but to meet it at the gate.

A number of beautiful and appropriate sentences of Scripture are added in the 1928 Book to those appointed to be said or sung at the beginning of the service. Two additional Psalms, xxiii and cxxx, are also provided. Before and after any Psalm or group of Psalms may be said or sung, the antiphon, "O Saviour of the world, who by thy Cross and precious Blood hast redeemed us: Save us and help us, we humbly beseech thee, O Lord," and at the end of the Psalms instead of the *Gloria Patri* may be said or sung: "Rest eternal grant unto them, O Lord: and let light perpetual shine upon them." It is also suggested that three of the prescribed lessons may be read, with one of the Psalms before each, or a hymn instead of a psalm before the Third Lesson; or the Lesson from 1 Cor. xv may be divided to form three Lessons. The additional lessons in the English Revision Book are 2 Cor. iv. 16 to end, and v. 1–10; Rev. vii. 9–17; Rev. xxi. 1–7. The American Book omits verses 29–34 from the Burial lesson, and the English Revision permits such omission. The American Book provides two alternative Lessons, and six alternative Psalms, and permits the closing of the service in church with a hymn, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, one or more Collects and the Blessing, "Unto God's gracious mercy," etc. The special Collect provided prays for the deceased "that increasing in knowledge and love of thee *he* may go from strength to strength, in the life of perfect service, in thy heavenly kingdom." [1]

At the grave, while the body is made ready to be laid into the earth, is said or sung the anthem beginning with Job xiv. 1, 2, which was one of the lections in the old Mattins for the dead, after which come the verses "In the midst of life," etc., supposedly written by Notker, a monk of St. Gall, Switzerland, in the ninth century. Alternative anthems are provided in the American and the English (1928) Books. For the Committal which follows, the American Revision inserts a commendation of the Soul: "Unto Almighty God we commit the soul of our *brother* departed, and we commit *his* body to the ground, etc." The English Revision restores the commendation of 1549 with very slight alteration.

The casting of earth upon the body is more ancient than Christianity. The Office of 1549 directed it to be done by the Minister, and according to the old Sarum rubric it was to be cast in the form of a cross.

After the Lord's Prayer in the new English Book follow appropriate Versicles and responses, and after the Collect are three prayers which are new. The first of these is: "O Father of all, we pray to thee for those whom we love, but see no longer. Grant them thy peace; let light perpetual shine upon them; and in thy loving wisdom and almighty power work in them the good purpose of thy perfect will; through Jesus Christ our Lord." Then follows a collect, which, if it is new, is in its beauty and brevity worthy to be classed with the best ancient collects: “ Almighty God, Father of all mercies and giver of all comfort; Deal graciously, we pray thee, with those who mourn, that casting every care on thee, they may know the consolation of thy love; through,” etc. (This is in the American Book, in the Form for the Burial of a Child.) The Canadian, American, Scottish and English Revisions have special optional forms for the Burial of a Child.

---

[1] The 1929 Scottish Book is similar in its enrichment to the English Revision, and has several more alternative Lessons.

Certain Burial Customs

In cases where the Office for the Burial of the Dead may not be used, the minister is not precluded from using any form of service. Various permissions have been given by individual Bishops, which lack the sure and certain hope of the Prayer Book Office but look to the tender mercies of God. Thus, in the diocese of Canterbury may be used the opening sentences, a penitential psalm, a lesson from several prescribed, “ Man that is born of woman,” etc., the Lesser Litany and Lord’s Prayer, and a choice of several appropriate collects. The Canadian Book has similar permissions, but more restricted.

There are several traditional customs connected with burial, of which the Prayer Book says nothing. First of all may be mentioned burial in consecrated ground, or ground hallowed and set apart for this purpose. It has always been the custom to consecrate burial-grounds, and in general cemeteries there is frequently a section set apart for the use of the Anglican Church, which the Bishop is asked to consecrate. Where this is not done, when there is a burial in unconsecrated ground, a form of Benediction of a Grave may be used.

Such a form is inserted in the Scottish and Canadian Prayer Books and also in the English Revision.

Again, it is an almost universal English custom that bodies should be laid facing the east, as in Baring-Gould's hymn:

> "For a space the tired body
> Lies with feet towards the dawn,"

and the coffin is so placed in the church at the time of the service, except in the case of a priest, who is laid in the chancel facing the people.

The sombre, black funeral trappings (which perhaps are not so bad now as they were half a century ago) are hardly in keeping with Christian hope, and the attempt to correct the abuse by the excessive use of flowers is open to a charge of ostentation. The good custom of earlier days was that the body should rest on an open carriage covered with a pall. This still survives in the case of military funerals, where the coffin is borne on a gun-carriage and covered with the Union Jack for a pall. The pall (which should be included among the "ornaments" of every church) is not necessarily black, but may be violet, white, dark blue, or other colour and is sometimes richly embroidered. There are beautiful examples of such palls in some of the churches in England. The one at Westminster Abbey, used at the funeral of Queen Alexandra, was described as "of white brocade, sumptuously and splendidly embroidered with gold and haughty colours." The feelings of natural sorrow and the sense of humiliation which springs from the thought that even the best among men are unworthy to enter the presence of God render signs of mourning befitting, but we are not to be sorry as men without hope, and so there should be something in the way of colour and beauty to relieve our sorrow. A good and inexpensive pall for the ordinary parish church may be made of violet cloth, fringed, with a broad red cross running from end to end and from side to side. It might be ornamented by embroidering a suitable text along the sides. Then there might be a smaller one of white material for children. When the coffin is taken from its carriage and placed upon the bier to be carried into the church the pall is spread over it, with perhaps one or two bunches of flowers or floral ornaments upon it.

The use of candles at funerals is also an old English custom, which very largely passed out for a time, but has been restored in many cases of late years, as appear from the newspaper accounts and pictures of the funerals of royal personages and others of prominence since this century opened. Thus at the funeral of Queen Alexandra: "Six tall candles lighted, three on either side, stood by the coffin;" and at Earl Haig's funeral: "Beside the bier five tall candles burned." They speak not of a life extinguished and gone forth into the dark, but of the light and joy which is the portion of the blessed in paradise. Probably the symbolism which the Freemasons find in them is that which Christians have always seen.

The Churching of Women

The former title of this Office was "The Order of the Purification of Women," but it was changed in 1552 toits present form, "*The Thanksgiving of Women after*

Childbirth, commonly called the Churching of Women." It is doubtless derived from the Jewish custom of which we read in St. Luke ii. 22. The time and place of this service are left very vague. There is no mention of publicity, as in the case of Baptism, but there are versicles and responses, which imply the presence of someone to respond. The Book of 1549 directed the woman to kneel "nigh unto the quire door," but now it is: "As hath been accustomed, or as the Ordinary shall direct." The rubric at the end: "*If there be a Communion, it is convenient that she receive the holy Communion,*" would suggest that the Churching should take place before the beginning of the Communion Office and that the woman should kneel at the chancel steps. The direction that "she be decently apparelled" refers to the old custom of wearing a veil. By the "accustomed offering" is meant a thank-offering on the part of the woman according to her ability and good-will. The American Book directs that it "shall be applied by the Minister and Churchwardens to the relief of distressed women in child-bed." The Scottish, Irish, Canadian, and English Revisions add a form of Benediction, the latter specifying that it is to be said "if there be no Communion at the time of the Churching."

In the Eastern Church there is not only the thanksgiving of the mother, but also the presentation of the child, as was the Jewish custom. The baptism takes place a few days after birth. After forty days the mother comes to church, bringing her child, and kneels at the steps before the Altar, while the Priest says a form of thanksgiving, and then takes the child in his arms, and turning towards the altar, presents him. Then, when he has returned the child to the mother, she takes him to the left door of the screen, where the priest administers to him the Holy Communion, using a spoon for the purpose.

The Commination

The term " Commination " signifies a threatening or denunciation, and this short service, to be used on Ash Wednesday after the Litany, is a threatening of God's wrath upon impenitent sinners. There was no such service before the Reformation, but there was an Office for Ash Wednesday consisting of the seven Penitential Psalms, with prayers and the blessing of ashes, which were put upon the heads of those present. The old form of discipline, under which notorious offenders were solemnly dismissed from the Church, to be restored (if penitent) on Maundy Thursday, had long been given up, and there was perhaps, as Bishop Barry suggests, " a certain tendency to neglect God's law, on pretence of the sufficiency of faith alone." The Commination, which was drawn up in 1549, is frequently misunderstood as a calling down of God's wrath upon sinners; but note that the form is not " cursed be he," but " cursed is he," which is a reminder by the Priest, with acknowledgment on the part of the congregation, that sinners who have transgressed God's laws are under a curse until they come to repentance. The " Amen " after each clause is not used in the sense of " so be it," but is an affirmation that " so it is."

The 51st Psalm follows the exhortation, and the Priest, when he says it, is to kneel " in the place where they are accustomed to say the Litany." This is a place other than the "reading-pew" mentioned before, and would be the chancel step or a faldstool set in the body of the church at the chancel entrance. It is interesting to note that the Penitential Psalms are still prescribed for Ash Wednesday, but not all at the one service as before. Psalms vi, xxxii and xxxviii are said at Mattins; li at Commination, and cii, cxxx and cxliii at Evensong.

The Commination was not retained in the American Prayer Book, but the latter part is given as a Penitential Office to be used on Ash Wednesday and at other times. The Irish Revision has substituted "A Penitential Service" for Commination. The opening part is the same, but in place of the Commination proper, a number of sentences from Holy Scripture are to be read by the Minister, leaving short spaces for private prayer. Then follows the 51st Psalm and the rest of the Office, as before. The Canadian Revision has changed the form of the sentences from "Cursed is he that" to "The wrath of God is upon him that." In the English Revision Book the form of the sentences is somewhat altered, each ending with the words "God shall judge," to which the answer is "Amen. Lord have mercy upon us," and the Exhortation following is shortened and simplified. The Scottish Revision also has "A Penitential Service," omitting the Comminations, beginning with the Commandments followed by a Lesson (St. Luke vi, 20-26), after which comes the latter part of the old service, beginning with Psalm li.

CHAPTER X

OF THE ORDINAL

The Apostolic Ministry

WHEN we profess in the Nicene Creed belief in the Apostolic Church, we imply, as Archdeacon Hobhouse phrases it, "a continuous historical link with the Apostles through the ministry, and the recognition of the principle that ministerial authority cannot be delegated from below, but must be handed down, so that there may be no interruption of the ministerial commission received by the Apostles, from above." This is not the place to enter into the discussion of the threefold ministry, the necessity of which has been questioned by some since the period of the Reformation. The Preface of the Ordinal, which is in accordance with Catholic teaching and practice everywhere, states: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

It is true that in the New Testament we find other particular ministries, as prophets, teachers, evangelists, and variations in titles, as when the terms "bishop" and "presbyter" (or elder) were used interchangeably (Acts xx. 17, 28), yet a threefold ministry is discernible from the first. St. Paul instructed Timothy and Titus in the exercise of what would now be called their "episcopal" duties of governing the Church in the sphere committed to their care, and of ordaining elders and deacons. It was only a generation later (about 110) that Ignatius declared that without bishops, presbyters and deacons there was no church. Thus, to quote from Dr. Frere, "the normal type of ministry for organized Christian Churches became the threefold form with which Church history is familiar." The English Church has always stood firmly for this. She might simplify the ceremonial of ordination by a return to customs of early days, but she was uncompromising in retaining the three orders, and the conferring of those orders by bishops, with the laying on of hands and prayer.

"*Divers Orders of Ministers in the Church*"

The non-episcopal bodies generally accept the two lower orders of the ministry, though the deacon is rather the highest lay officer than a lower clerical order. In the established Church of Scotland the principle of ministerial succession is held, but it is succession through presbyters. Leading Scottish ministers of recent times, like Dr. Milligan and Dr. Cooper, took a higher view of the presbyter's office than is taken by some of our own teachers.

The Diaconate, or office of a deacon, is always subsidiary to that of a priest or presbyter; the word "deacon" means a "servant." With us it is usually a preparatory step to the priesthood, and so it is in the Roman Church. In the East, however, it is frequently a permanent office. The duties as laid down in the

Ordinal are (1) to assist the Priest in Divine Service, and especially at Holy Communion; (2) to read Holy Scriptures and Homilies (or sermons) in the Church; (3) to instruct the youth in the Catechism, which would mean now to give diligence to Sunday School work; (4) to baptize infants in the absence of the Priest—notice that the Deacon is not ordinarily the Minister of baptism; (5) to preach, not as a matter of course, but only if licensed by the Bishop; (6) to visit the sick and poor with a view to their relief.

The Priest (or Presbyter) is one who is charged with full authority for the ministry of the Word and sacraments. The "elders," who in the Apostles' day were ordained for every Church, were the presbyters whom we call priests in the Prayer Book. Wiclif's translation of the New Testament uses "priest" where the A.V. has "elder" in Titus i. 5, "that thou shouldst ordaine priestes by cities, as I also appointed thee." Hooker (1600) expresses his own preference for the term Presbyter instead of Priest, because to some "the name of Priest is odious, though without cause." The Scottish Liturgy uses the term "presbyter," but the American Church, though taking its Communion Office largely from the Scottish, preferred the English term "priest." "What the Christian apostles, prophets, evangelists, overseers, elders, ministers were called matters very little," says Canon Lacey, "the important question is what they were." One thing is certain: it was the fixed purpose of the English Church, even in the troublous days of 1552, to hold fast the ministry which it had received. That purpose is clearly expressed in the Preface to the Ordinal:

"to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of England." But (it may be asked) is there any true priesthood in the Anglican Church? If we say there is not we cannot justly claim to belong to that company of whom it is said, "Ye are an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. ii. 5). St. Paul teaches us (1 Cor. xii.) that we are all members of the spiritual Body of Christ, and that the body functions through its various organs. So, as Bishop Lightfoot says, "The minister's function is *representative* without being *vicarial*. He is a priest as the mouthpiece, the delegate of a priestly race." In early days it was common to speak of presbyters and bishops as two degrees of the priesthood. "According to the traditional teaching of the Western Church," says Bishop Headlam, "Bishops and Priests constitute only one Order, the difference between the two being that of authority and position, not of order."

The term "Bishop" means "overseer" and implies headship in the Church. What the Apostles were in the first age of the Church, that Bishops are now. To them pertains the oversight of the Church, and, following the example of the Apostles, they are the ministers of ordination and confirmation. It was not from men, but by divine appointment (1 Cor. xii. 28) that the Apostles were set first in the Church, and that same office, called by another name, has always been, and still is, first in the Church. St. Irenæus (about 202) found the guarantee of true doctrine in the succession of bishops from the Apostles. Dr. Whitney declares that history shows episcopacy to be "the product and the keeper of Christian life; it was thus through the storm of early heresies and the rush of barbarian invasions. Then for fourteen centuries it remained the normal type of Christian organization."

Besides these three orders we find, as early as the first half of the third century, and from then on, mention of minor orders of the Ministry: sub-deacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers and door-keepers. These were commonly considered necessary steps towards Holy Orders, as the three already mentioned were exclusively called. A notable historical instance of this is found in the case of Photius (886), who was elected Patriarch of Constantinople when he was a layman, and he went through the minor orders one each day during the week preceding his consecration. The rules, however, requiring this varied at different times and in different places. The admission to the minor orders was not by laying on of hands, and was not restricted to the bishops, and those admitted to minor orders only were regarded as still laymen. The last survival of minor orders in England was that of Parish Clerk or Collet (which was the English form of acolyte), an office well known until the middle of the nineteenth century. He led the responses and the singing and assisted the parson in various ways. In the old "three-decker" the clerk occupied the lower stage. He might wear a surplice, and in the time of Archbishop Grindall (1583) he was directed to read the First Lesson and the Epistle. Customs change, and not always for the better. The parish clerk has gone, and we have now lay readers, whose appointment and duties vary in different dioceses. To some extent they are a revival of the minor order of readers, or lectors, but sometimes their admission to office is merely the receipt of a licence from the Bishop, which fails to set forth clearly what their duties are and what are their limitations.

The Character and Meaning of the Ordinal

The Ordinal, or (to give it its full title) " *The Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating of Bishops Priests and Deacons according to the order of the Church of England*, is not, strictly speaking, a part of the Book of Common Prayer, but something which is bound up with the Prayer Book. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI did not include the Ordinal, which was drawn up in 1549 and published in 1550, and was afterwards with some revision appended to the second Prayer Book in 1552. It was taken, in the main, from the Sarum Pontifical (a book of rites to be performed by a Bishop), but with considerable simplification. Many things were left out which were not thought essential, and new matter, chiefly in the form of exhortations, was inserted. The old services were, of course, in Latin. Cranmer and the other bishops associated with him in drawing up the first Ordinal in English retained the delivery of the " chalice or cup with the bread " in the Ordering of Priests, and of the pastoral staff at the Consecration of Bishops. There were also certain directions as to the vestments to be worn, which were subsequently omitted.

A few words may be said concerning the qualifications of candidates, and first as to age. The Preface says a Deacon must be twenty-three years of age, "unless he have a Faculty." This means a special dispensation to do something which it would not be lawful to do without such dispensation. In the Ordinal of 1550 the minimum of age was twenty-one. A priest must be fully twenty-four, and a bishop fully thirty years of age. The American Book simply says "of the age which the Canon in that case provided may require." Then there is the question of "virtuous conversation" or good character. To ensure this each candidate must bring Letters Testimonial signed by three beneficed priests, who have known him, and the *Si Quis* ("If anyone") is to be publicly read on Sunday three weeks before the ordination, in the parish church of every candidate, asking that if anyone knows any reason why he should not be ordained he will declare it. As to learning, the Archdeacon (or his deputy) must declare that the candidates have been duly examined and found fit. Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Prayer Book as agreeable in their teaching to the Word of God, and an oath of canonical obedience to the Bishop and to the Canons of the Church, are also required. In the Ember Collects, too, the Church prays for those to be ordained "that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth [God's] glory." If some, notwithstanding all these things, are ordained who are manifestly unfit for the sacred ministry, it is not because the Church has not taken reasonable precaution.

Ordination is always accompanied by the celebration of the Holy Communion, according to the unvarying custom of the early Church. The admission to each order has its own place in the service. Minor orders used to be conferred before the reading of the Epistle. In our present Ordinal, according to ancient usage, the ordination of Deacons comes between the Epistle and the Gospel. Priests are ordained after the reading of the Gospel, and the Consecration of Bishops comes after the Sermon, which in this case follows the Nicene Creed. In the ordering both of Deacons and Priests the Sermon comes first of all, and then the candidates are presented to the Bishop, "sitting in his chair near to the holy Table." The rubric specifies that they shall be "decently habited." "Decently" here means, properly, in the vestments which according to the custom of the Church they are entitled to wear. In 1550, for Deacons the rule was that "each should have on him a plain alb," and after ordination, not before, one of the Deacons, "putting on a tunicle," was directed to read the Gospel.

When the Bishop has commended the candidates to the prayers of the congregation the Litany is sung or said, with a special suffrage. The provision in the English Revision for shortening the Litany is a great gain here. The American Revisers have provided a special Litany for Ordination which is very brief. It is to be noted that in the Ordinal the Litany does not include the Prayer of St. Chrysostom and the Grace, for it is an introduction to the Communion Service, which follows at once, as far as the Epistle.

In the examination of those who are to be ordered Deacons, which comes in here, the first question concerns the inward call; the second deals with the call to serve in this particular Church, and the third with belief in the Holy Scriptures. This last varies in different books. In the form of 1662 it is: " Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?" The Canadian Book has: "Do you believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation?" The American Book has: "Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain all Doctrine required as necessary for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ?" The new English form, followed by the Scottish Book, reads: "Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given of God to convey to us in many parts and in divers manners the revelation of himself which is fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ?" After this come the promises to read the Scriptures to the people, to do the work of a Deacon, to set a wholesome example to the flock, and to render reverent obedience.

Bishop Frere says: "Those who are familiar with the old services will regret that the revisers (1550) abandoned the great Consecratory Prayer prefaced by the solemn bidding, the salutation, and the *Sursum Corda*." This ancient feature is restored in the English and Scottish Revisions, where, just after the examination, the Bishop says: "Let us pray to Almighty God, dearly beloved, that it may please him to accept these his servants now called into the Order of Deacons in his Church, and to pour upon them the grace of his heavenly benediction."

Then those who are to be ordained, with the congregation, shall kneel down ; and, after silent prayer, the Bishop shall say,

Lift up your hearts;

Answer. We lift them up unto the Lord.

Bishop. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God;

Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

Then shall the Bishop continue :

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God; and especially are we bound to praise thee, because of thy great goodness thou dost send forth labourers into thy harvest, and hast vouchsafed to call these thy servants into the Office of Deacons in thy Church. Fill them, we beseech thee, with the Holy Ghost, that, enabled by the sevenfold gift of his grace, they may be faithful to their promises, modest, humble, and constant in their ministration, and may have a ready will to observe all spiritual discipline; that, having the testimony of a good conscience, they may continue ever stable and strong in thy Son Christ; to whom," etc.

It will be noticed that this reproduces to some extent the special prayer before the Benediction, which in the new Book is omitted.

The actual Ordination of Deacons is very simple. The candidates kneel before the Bishop, who lays his hands—not "hand," as in Confirmation—upon each one severally, and says the words conveying authority to execute the office committed to him, in the Name of the blessed Trinity. Note that he is made a Deacon not in this particular Church but "in the Church of

God." The preceding prayers, indicating what that office is, and the laying on of the Bishop's hands are the essentials of ordination. Then follows the delivery of the New Testament with authority to read the Gospel in the Church, and to preach the same with the Bishop's licence. In the Sarum Pontifical it was not the New Testament, but the Book of the Gospels which was delivered, symbolizing the Deacon's right to read the liturgical Gospel. There was also there the putting on of the stole, which is not in our present order, though the custom is followed by many bishops. The stole is worn by Deacons over the left shoulder and tied under the right arm according to Western usage, but in the East the ends hang loose. When a Deacon wears a black scarf, or tippet (as it is called in the 58th Canon of 1604), it should be worn over both shoulders, as the Priest wears it. The graduate's tippet is of silk: the non-graduate's of stuff. It is not another form of the stole but something quite distinct. The stole was formerly worn with the vestment, and was of the same colour. It is commonly worn with the surplice at baptisms, marriages and burials, but its use for Morning and Evening Prayer has neither law nor custom to support it, and the black tippet is more correct. There is no restriction of the use of the tippet to chaplains or dignitaries, and no distinction in the scarves worn by different ranks of the clergy.

The Ordering of Priests follows the same plan as that of Deacons. After the Gospel comes the Bishop's exhortation to the candidates, which is not ancient, but is largely taken from Bucer's draft of Ordination Services. In it the pastoral character of the Ministry is set forth at some length and very impressively. The questions put to the candidates are of similar character to those in the Ordering of Deacons, but deal more particularly with pastoral work. They cover the duties of teaching the people, of faithfully ministering the doctrine and Sacraments, of resisting heresy and false teaching, of diligence in prayers and the study of the Scriptures, laying aside studies which conflict with this, of leading exemplary lives, of avoiding quarrels, and of obedience to those in authority. When the candidates have promised to do all things required, there is a space for silent prayer, and then the hymn *Veni Creator Spiritus* is sung, "the Bishop beginning, and the Priests and others that are present answering by verse," as indicated by the lines in italics. The shorter version, by Bishop Cosin, was inserted in 1662. Why the earlier "diffuse and paraphrastic" version has been retained so long, seeing it is never used, it is difficult to explain. All the recent Revisions but the Canadian have dropped it. The American inserts as an alternative the hymn—

"Come, Holy Ghost, Creator blest."

The English Book (1928) and the Scottish restore here the consecratory Prayer introduced by the *Sursum Corda* (" Lift up our hearts "), etc., and incorporating the prayer which follows *Veni Creator* in the old Book.

The rubric before the ordination says: "The Bishop with the Priests present shall lay their hands severally upon the head of everyone that receiveth the Order of Priesthood." "According to ancient custom," says Bishop Barry, "the priests present take part—the Bishop being thus seen to act after the primitive custom, as the head of his College of Presbyters. But it has been universally recognized in all ages of the Church that the power of Ordination belongs properly to the Bishop, and that the co-operation of the priests is not essential." St. Paul reminds Timothy of the gift which he had received "*with* the laying on of hands of the presbytery" (1 Tim. iv. 14), but in another place he speaks of it as that "which is in thee *by* the putting on of my hands" (2 Tim. i. 6). Note the difference in the prepositions.

There is a striking solemnity in the actual ordination of the Priest, when the Bishop says to him: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest," and authorizes him to execute the functions of that office. Our Blessed Lord's own words are quoted, giving to the ministry of His Church power and commandment to declare and pronounce to His people the absolution and remission of their sins. The American Ordinal has an alternative form of words here, modelled on the form for Deacons: "Take thou Authority to execute the Office of a Priest, etc.," and omitting the scriptural formula from St. John xx. 23. The question may arise whether this does not alter the character of the priesthood conferred. But remember that the essentials of ordination do not include any special form of words. They are prayer, with definite reference to the office to be conferred, and the imposition of hands by the Bishop. As a matter of fact the formula in the English Order, although it is taken in the main from the old Latin, is not of great antiquity, but originated probably in the thirteenth century.

The laying on of hands was sometimes done in silence, and the Eastern and Western forms differ greatly, yet not so as to leave any question of the validity of the ordinations. But here we come to another matter which is urged against our ministry. The ordination proper was followed in the Latin service books by the delivery of a chalice and paten (technically called the "Porrection of the Instruments") to each of those ordained, with the words: "Take thou the power of offering the Sacrifice in the Church for the living and the dead." Our present Order has instead the delivery of a Bible with the words "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to administer the holy Sacraments." According to the Ordinal of 1550 the Bishop delivered the Bible in one hand and the chalice with the bread in the other, but the latter was omitted in 1552. This omission means, it is alleged, that a complete change in the character of the Ministry was intended, which is certainly not in keeping with the intention plainly expressed in the Preface of continuing the historic Ministry. The Latin for "priest" is "*sacerdos*," a word of horror to some, and they would have us believe that the term "priest" has had no such meaning in the English Church since the middle of the sixteenth century, overlooking the fact that the Latin title of Article XXXII, "Of the Marriage of Priests," is *De conjugio sacerdotum*, and that in the Latin Prayer Book of 1660 (published in the collection of the Parker Society), the term "priest" is rendered *sacerdos* over and over again. The objection that the omission of the Porrection of the Instruments renders our Orders invalid overlooks the fact that the earliest forms of ordination do not contain it, and even in the Roman Church it was not used before the tenth century, though the Gallican Church had it earlier.

The authority to administer the holy Sacraments covers all things pertaining to the Sacraments, and when a man is admitted to the office of a Priest in the Church of God by one who has the power of ordination, there can be no room for doubt that he is qualified to do all that a Priest may do. "There was a great desire," says Bishop Frere, commenting on the English Ordinal, "to recover a wider and truer view of the functions of the Ministry, to include the pastoral and prophetical side of the office, as well as the specially sacerdotal side." The three terms Messengers, Watchmen and Stewards used in the Exhortation may be taken as pointing respectively to the prophetic, pastoral and priestly functions of the Ministry. They who are called to be ministers of the Word to deliver God's message to men are also with watchful care to tend and feed the flock of Christ, and to be stewards of the mysteries of God.

The form of the Consecration of Bishops differs less from the Ordering of Priests than that service does from the Ordering of Deacons. First note that the Consecration is always to take place on a Sunday or Holy-day—in the American Church this requirement is omitted. The arrangement differs somewhat from that of the former services. It begins with the Holy Communion, and the Sermon comes in the usual place after the Nicene Creed. Then follows the presentation by two Bishops of the Bishop-elect, vested in his rochet, which is a long linen garment, something like an alb, with sleeves gathered at the wrists. The full balloon-sleeves, which were the product of ecclesiastical tailors of the eighteenth century, were unknown in earlier days, and have passed out of use now. When the candidate is presented, the Mandate for Consecration, or Testimonials, or Certificates canonically required, as the case may be, are read and the oath of obedience taken to the Archbishop or Metropolitan, or (in the American Church) an oath of conformity to the doctrine and discipline of the Church. The Archbishop then bids to prayer, and the Litany follows. The examination is similar to that in the case of Priests, the only question peculiar to the Bishop's office being: "Will you be faithful in ordaining, sending, or laying hands upon others?" After the examination the Bishop-elect puts on the rest of the episcopal habit, which, according to present custom, is the chimere, a sleeveless robe sometimes of scarlet cloth, but generally black satin, which was probably the Doctor's gown with sleeves removed for convenience. The *Veni Creator* is then sung, and here again (as in the Ordering of Deacons and Priests) the English and Scottish Revisions have the Consecratory Prayer, embodying the prayer in the Order of 1662.

All the Bishops present take part in the laying on of hands. It was a rule laid down by the first General Council of Nicæa (325), as being the custom of the Church, that there should be three Bishops for every consecration, and the English Church has never departed from that rule. There was also an ancient custom that two Bishops should lay the Gospel-book upon the head and neck of the Bishop-elect as he knelt, and in the Ordinal of 1550 the direction to the Archbishop was not (as it is now) to "deliver the Bible to him," but to "lay the Bible upon his neck." The charge now given at the delivery of the Bible is a twofold one, the first part referring to doctrine, and the second to pastoral work. In 1550 the first part was said, and then the pastoral staff was delivered into the Bishop's hands with the words "Be thou unto the flock a shepherd." Although the specific direction is omitted, this is frequently done now, and it is a significant and edifying ceremony. The Pastoral Staff, or Crozier, is a very ancient ornament which passed out of use in the Church of England for about three centuries, but is used by most Bishops at the present time. The emphasis laid upon the pastoral duties at the Consecration of Bishops points to the fact that the pastoral responsibility for the whole Diocese rests upon the Bishop, and is only delegated by him to the Priests who serve under him.

There is also in the old Ordinals the delivery of the mitre and the ring. It is a very strange anomaly that while for three hundred years it was thought fitting that Bishops should use the mitre as an ornament for their official seats, their carriages, their seals and letters, its use as a covering for the head was not considered proper. There are signs that this inconsistency will soon be a thing of the past. Episcopal rings, generally engraved as seals, are in common use now. They were given formerly as tokens of investiture with the dignity of the office, as is done at the coronation of a king. The ring is commonly worn on the middle finger of the right hand. The pectoral cross, which has come into wide use as an episcopal ornament during the past half-century, can claim some ancient precedent, but is not found in the Ordinals of the Middle Ages and was not in use in the time of Edward VI.

ADDITIONAL MATTER

The supplementary matter contained in the various editions of the Prayer Book does not call for extended comment, but is for the most part self-explanatory.

The Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea are chiefly for use in the Royal Navy. They are not a service by themselves, but the Prayer Book offices are to be used ordinarily, and these special devotions as occasion require.

The Accession Services were annexed to the Prayer Book by Royal Proclamation in 1859, and were revised and set forth in their present form in 1901. They provide special Psalms, Lessons, Suffrages and Collects for Mattins and Evensong, a Collect, Epistle and Gospel for Holy Communion, and a special service consisting of the *Te Deum*, Lord's Prayer, special Suffrages and Collects. The Canadian Book has special forms of service for Harvest Thanksgiving, or Missions and for Children. Both the American and Canadian Books have Prayers to be used in Families. The Canadian Revision adds the forms commonly used in English dioceses for Institution and Induction, for Laying Foundation Stones for Churches, for the Consecration of Churches and of Burial Grounds. The American Book includes forms for Consecrating a Church or Chapel, and for Institution.

In the English Revision there is an Appendix containing the services of Prime and Compline for early morning and late evening, closely following the forms in the Breviary. These are short and easily followed and are a great enrichment. There is also a devotion for Priest and people to be said immediately before Holy Communion.

The Articles of Religion, which are for the clergy only and not for the laity, are commonly printed with the Prayer Book, but are not a part of it.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY R. CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
Bungay, Suffolk

Date Due

Mr 13 '45

JUN 3 0 2000

JUN 3 0 2001

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01021 9667